

DIVERSE VIEWS ON THE LEGITIMACY OF THE OTTOMAN
SULTANATE AMONG GREEK CHRONICLERS OF THE EARLY MODERN
PERIOD

by
HENRY R. SHAPIRO

Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Sabanci University
Spring 2011

DIVERSE VIEWS ON THE LEGITIMACY OF THE OTTOMAN SULTANATE
AMONG GREEK CHRONICLERS OF THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD

APPROVED BY:

Prof. Dr. İ. Metin Kunt
(Thesis Supervisor)

Prof. Dr. Nevra Necipoğlu

Assist. Prof. Hülya Adak

DATE OF APPROVAL:4 July 2011.....

© Henry R. Shapiro 2011

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

DIVERSE VIEWS ON THE LEGITIMACY OF THE OTTOMAN SULTANATE AMONG GREEK CHRONICLERS OF THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD

Henry R. Shapiro

History MA, 2011

Prof. Dr. İ. Metin Kunt

Keywords: Ottoman History

Much research has been done on ways that the Ottoman sultanate sought to boost its legitimacy among its subjects. The degree to which non-Muslims considered the sultanate to be legitimate, however, has not been thoroughly investigated. Rather it has been assumed in literature on the topic that non-Muslims could not fully endorse the legitimacy of the Ottoman sultanate because of religious antagonism. This thesis addresses this question in depth by assessing the views of nine Early Modern Greek chronicle writers regarding the legitimacy of the Ottoman sultanate. The introduction of this thesis provides intellectual contextualization through brief discussions of Byzantine and Ottoman political theory. It is followed by a second chapter that describes the views of Greek chroniclers who did not consider the Ottoman sultanate to be legitimate. The third chapter analyzes the views of one chronicler who accepted the legitimacy of the Ottoman sultanate without justifying his views. Finally, the fourth chapter analyses two groups of chroniclers who crafted legitimizing discourses in support of the Ottoman sultanate. The thesis ends with consideration of the nine chronicles audiences and with questions about the degree to which intellectuals influenced each other across linguistic and religious borders in the Eastern Mediterranean of the Early Modern Period. In sum, this thesis shows that Early Modern Greek chronicle writers had diverse views on the legitimacy of the Ottoman sultanate and that some of them crafted legitimizing discourses in support of their Muslim rulers. A translation of the *Patriarchal History of Constantinople* appends the thesis.

ÖZET

OSMANLI DEVLETİNİN MEŞRUIYETİNE İLİŞKİN RUM VAKAYİNÜVİSLERİN GÖRÜŞLERİ

Henry R. Shapiro

Tarih Yüksek Lisans Programı, 2011

Doç. Doc. İ. Metin Kunt

Anahtar Kelimeleri: Osmanlı Tarihi

Osmanlı devletinin kendi tebaası arasında meşruiyetini nasıl artırmaya çalıştığı üzerine çok sayıda araştırma yapılmıştır. Ancak, gayri-Müslimlerin devletin meşruiyeti hakkındaki görüşleri pek incelenmemiştir. Literatürde, dini husumetten ötürü gayri-Müslimlerin Osmanlı devletinin meşruluğunu tamamıyla onaylamadıkları varsayılmıştır. Bu tez, Osmanlı devletinin meşruiyetine ilişkin dokuz Rum vakayinüvisin görüşlerine bakarak bu soruyu incelemektedir. Tezin giriş bölümünde, Bizans ve Osmanlı siyaset teorisindeki argümanların kısa bir özetine dayanarak konunun entelektüel çevresi sunulmaktadır. İkinci bölümde, Osman devletinin meşru olmadığına inanan Rum vakayinüvislerin görüşleri anlatılmaktadır. Üçüncü bölümde ise, rasyoneli ifade edilmeyen devletin meşruiyetini destekleyen bir vakanüvisin görüşlerine yer verilmektedir. Dördüncü bölümde iki vakayinüvis grubunun Osmanlı devletini meşrulaştıran diskurları incelenmektedir. Tezin sonuç bölümünde, bahsi geçen dokuz vakayinüvisin okuyucuları ve Yeni Çağ'da Doğu Akdeniz'de entelektüellerin dini/dilsel sınırları arasında birbirlerini ne derecede etkiledikleri incelenmektedir. Özet olarak, bu tez Yeni Çağ Rum vakayinüvislerin Osmanlı devletinin meşruiyeti konusunda muhtelif görüşleri olduğunu ve bazılarının Osmanlıları desteklemek için devleti meşrulaştıran diskurları yarattıklarını göstermektedir. *İstanbul Rum Patrikhanesinin Tarihi'nin* çevirisi bir ek olarak sunulmuştur.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am, above all, grateful to my thesis advisor, Professor İ. Metin Kunt, for his careful feedback and encouragement. I made considerable intellectual progress while under his tutelage during my years at Sabancı, and I will always consider him to have been a key academic mentor.

I will also always be indebted to my Turkish professor, Hakan T. Karateke, for encouraging my study of Ottoman history and my decision to continue my studies in Turkey at a key juncture in my early career. His article, “Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate,” also served as a key piece of inspiration in the production of this thesis.

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction	1
The Place of the Emperor in Byzantine Political Thought	3
The Place of the Sultan in Ottoman Political Thought	7
A Deep Reservoir of Epithets and Images	13
Chapter II: The Ottomans as Illegitimate Rulers.....	15
Doukas and his History	16
Georgios Sphrantzes and his Memoir	21
Makarios Melissourgos-Melissenos and the <i>Chronicon Maius</i>	24
The Codex Oxoniensis-Lincolniensis	28
Conclusions.....	29
Chapter III: “Habitual Legitimacy”	31
The Codex Barberinus Graecus 111 or Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans.....	31
Conclusions.....	37
Chapter IV: “Normative” Theories of Legitimacy for Ottoman Rule.....	39
Kritovoulos of Imbros and the Proemium of his History	39
Laonikos Chalkokondyles and his Demonstrations of Histories, Books I-III	43
Kritovoulos and Chalkokondyles: A Common Response to a Post-Byzantine Reality	47
Manuel Malaxos, Damaskenos the Stoudite and the Patriarchal History of Constantinople	48
Papasynadinos and his Chronicle of Serres	57
Conclusions.....	59
Chapter V: Conclusions.....	61
Place, Time, and Audience	61
Turks, Greeks, and Italians: A Shared Intellectual World?	64
The Patriarchal History of Constantinople: From 1454 until 1578.....	67
Gennadios Scholarios the Wise	68
Isidoron: Holy Monk and Spiritual [Father]	74
Ioasaf: The Holy Monk Called Kousas.....	75
Markos, the Holy Monk Xilokaravis	77
Simeon the Holy Monk from Trabzon.....	79
Dionysios Metropolitan of Philippopolis.....	80
Simeon of Trabzon Again.....	82

Raphael the Serbian Monk.....	83
Maximos the Learned and Very Wise	84
Niphon, Metropolitan of Thessaloniki	90
Dionysios, the Former Patriarch	92
Maximos, Metropolitan of Serres	92
Niphon, the Former Patriarch Again.....	93
Ioakeim, Metropolitan of Drama	94
Pachomios Metropolitan of Zichon	96
Ioakeim Receives the Patriarchal Throne Again	96
Pachomios, the Former Patriarch Again	97
Theoleptos, Metropolitan of Ioannina	102
Jeremiah I, Metropolitan of Sophia	103
Ioannikios I of Sozopolis	104
Ieremias, the Patriarch Again.....	105
Dionysios, Metropolitan of Nikomedia	113
Ioasaph, Metropolitan of Hadrianopolis	116
Metrophanes, Metropolitan of Kaisareia	121
Ieremias, Metropolitan of Larissa	122
Bibliography	129
Primary Sources	129
Secondary Sources	130

Chapter I: Introduction

Much research has been done in recent years on ways that the Ottoman sultanate sought to bolster its legitimacy in the eyes of its subjects. For example, in *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power*, a collection of essays edited by Hakan T. Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski, scholars investigate how the Ottomans imagined the ideal polity and ruler; the role of religion in bolstering the legitimacy of the state; and the roots and consequences of “the crisis of Ottoman legitimacy” in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. One topic that researchers on the topic have not investigated in as much depth, however, is the degree to which non-Muslims regarded the Ottoman sultanate as legitimate.

In “Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate,” one essay in the above-mentioned edition, Hakan T. Karateke proposes the concept of “tolerated legitimacy” to explain how non-Muslims saw the sultanate as legitimate in a fundamentally different way from Sunni Muslim subjects.¹ There he describes a hypothetical Orthodox Christian priest who could never “sincerely” accept the “normative legitimacy” of the sultanate. That is to say, he could never believe that “the sultan is *the* ruler sent to us by God,” he could only acknowledge a right to rule “born mainly of fatalism.”² In my reading of Ottoman-Greek literature of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, however, I have come across a range of views on the topic of Ottoman legitimacy. While some authors evince a view similar to the “habitual legitimacy” described by Karateke, others imply that the sultanate was illegal, while still others developed arguments for the legitimacy of the Ottomans that can be considered “normative.”

In this thesis I will analyze nine Greek chronicles in order to discern their authors’ views on the legitimacy of the Ottoman state. Four of these authors—Doukas,

¹ Hakan T. Karateke, “Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate,” *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power*, Ed. Hakan T. Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski, (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 33.

² Karateke, 33-34.

Sphrantzes, Kritovoulos, and Chalkokondyles—wrote in the fifteenth century; three—the author of the *Patriarchal History of Constantinople*, Melissourgos-Melissenos, and an anonymous chronicler—wrote in the sixteenth century; and two—the author of the *Chronicle of Turkish Sultans* and the priest Papasynadinos—wrote in the seventeenth century. Rather than organizing this analysis chronologically, however, I will arrange it according to chroniclers' views. That is to say, I will dedicate distinct chapters to authors who considered the Ottomans illegitimate (Chapter II), to authors who recognized Ottoman legitimacy out of "habit" or "toleration" (Chapter III), and to authors who developed arguments in support of the "normative" legitimacy of the Ottoman state (Chapter IV). In a concluding chapter, I will also look for patterns relating to these chroniclers' locations, temporal contexts and changes over time, and projected audiences and aims in an effort to postulate what factors may have most influenced Ottoman-Greek intellectuals' views on the Ottoman state's legitimacy.

Before proceeding with this analysis, however, this introduction should focus on understanding the intellectual context in which these authors wrote. The mindset gap between modern readers and any of the above-mentioned chroniclers is so large that many might not understand Karateke's need to distinguish between "habitual" and "normative" legitimacy. For instance, a modern-day Protestant Christian, better versed in Scripture than in Church History, might react to the question of legitimacy by saying, "Render...unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's" (Matt. 22:21).³ With these words he or she would correctly point out that the Gospel writers and Paul had no conception of a temporal "holy Roman emperor." Quite to the contrary, the pagan Roman emperors were often harsh persecutors whom early Christians were merely obliged to "tolerate." But unlike the early Christians, Byzantine and Ottoman Christians had an alternative model of temporal Christian kingship, one which was also influenced by pagan models. Likewise Ottoman-Christians' Muslim contemporaries often conceived of their sultans within a theological framework. This introduction will focus on the theorization of emperor and sultan in Byzantine and Ottoman political thought.

³ *The Holy Bible: Containing the Old and New Testaments, King James Version*, (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1950), 26.

The Place of the Emperor in Byzantine Political Thought

Much scholarship on Byzantine political thought has focused on the relation between the Orthodox Church and the imperial office in a “Byzantine Theocracy.” Western scholars of the nineteenth and early twentieth century have traditionally summarized the relationship with a single word: “Caesaropapism.” Aristeides Papadakis and Alexander Kazhdan define Caesaropapism as the “conventional term for the allegedly unlimited power of the [Byzantine Emperor] over the church, including unilateral intervention in doctrinal questions ordinarily reserved to ecclesiastical authority.” They add that the term implies that the Church “lost its own sphere of competence and essential independence; it became, in effect, an adjunct of the state bureaucracy.”⁴

Byzantine primary sources reveal that, in stark contrast to the concept of Caesaropapism, the theoretical limits of imperial power over church affairs was nuanced and controversial among Byzantine intellectuals and that the actual limits of imperial power ebbed and flowed throughout Byzantine history. For example, in the eighth century John of Damascus, who is famous for his defense of icon veneration during the iconoclastic controversy, wrote,

It appertains not to kings to make laws for the Church. Kings have not preached the word to you, but apostles and prophets, pastors and doctors. Political welfare is the concern of kings: the ecclesiastical system is a matter for pastors and doctors; and this [Emperor Leo III’s support of iconoclasm], brethren, is an act of brigandage.⁵

Here John seeks to undermine the position of his theological enemy, the militarily powerful Emperor Leo III, who he believes had transcended the limits of his imperial authority by deposing an iconodule patriarch and by imposing his theological views on the Church and empire.⁶ Unlike many other Byzantine emperors, Leo III was powerful enough to impose his will upon the Church regarding a doctrinal issue.

⁴ Aristeides Papadakis and Alexander Kazhdan, “Caesaropapism,” *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, (Oxford University Press, 1991), Vol. I, 364.

⁵ John of Damascus, as quoted in Ernest Barker, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium: Passages from Byzantine Writers and Documents*, (Oxford University Press, 1961), 86.

⁶ See George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1969), 164.

In other contexts, churchmen could write with an entirely different tone. Centuries later, in 1395, the Patriarch of Constantinople Antonius IV wrote to the Grand Prince of Moscow Vasily I that

The holy emperor has a great place in the Church: he is not as other rulers and the governors of other regions are; and this is because the emperors, from the beginning, established and confirmed true religion (*eusebeia*) in all the inhabited world (*oikoumene*). They convoked the oecumenical councils; they confirmed, and ordered to be accepted, the pronouncements of the divine and holy canons concerning true doctrines and the government of Christian men; they struggled hard against heresies... For all these reasons the emperors have a great place and honour in the Church. Yea even if, by the permission of God, the nations [i.e. the Ottomans] now encircle the government and the residence of the emperor, the emperor has still to this day the same appointment (*cheirotomia*) and support from the Church...he is anointed with the solemn myrrh, and appointed *basileus* and *autokrator* of the Romans—to wit, of all Christians.⁷

Unlike in the passage by John of Damascus, Antonius seeks here to bolster the prerogatives of a far weaker emperor, Manuel II Palaiologos. These passages show that any primary sources about Byzantine political thought should be read with careful attention to political and historical context and that Church-state relations in Byzantium are more complex than to allow for a one-word summary like Caesaropapism.

Many scholars, including Steven Runciman, Francis Dvornik, Dimiter Angelov, and Gilbert Dagron have studied Byzantine political thought with historical sensitivity. In *The Byzantine Theocracy*, Steven Runciman offers an introduction to the history and theory of Church-State relations in Byzantium from Constantine until 1453 in which he presents the writings of Emperor Constantine I's biographer and contemporary, Eusebius, as the key to understanding all of Byzantine political theory. Runciman writes that Eusebius depicted Constantine as

...the wise king who was the imitation of God, ruling a realm which could now become the imitation of Heaven....The king is not God among men but the Viceroy of God. He is not the *logos* incarnate but is in a special relation with the *logos*. He has been specially appointed and is continually inspired by God, the friend of God, the interpreter of the Word of God. His eyes look upward, to receive the messages of God. He must be surrounded with the reverence and glory that befits God's earthly copy; and he will 'frame his earthly government according to the pattern of the divine original, finding strength in its conformity with the monarchy of God.'⁸

⁷ "A Letter of the Patriarch Antonius to Vasili I, Grand Prince of Russia On the Unity of the Empire and the Church and the Universality of the Empire," as quoted in Barker, 194.

⁸ Steven Runciman, *The Byzantine Theocracy*, (Cambridge University Press, 1977), 22.

Runciman frequently refers to this conception of the emperor as an “image of God upon earth” as the “Eusebian theory.”

After describing the Eusebian theory, Runciman goes on to comment on how the theory fails to address “the relations of the divine Empire with the Roman Law and Roman constitutional traditions” and “how...the priestly hierarchy fit into the theory,”⁹ and he shows how these questions were at the heart of many conflicts in Byzantium. Runciman concludes his book by writing that, despite these tension points, “the Eusebian theory had endured, coloured in various tints down the centuries but structurally unaltered”¹⁰ until 1453. That is to say, the emperor was considered to be “the Viceroy of God” by Byzantines throughout the empire’s history.

Runciman does acknowledge in passing that Byzantine theories of kingship were influenced by earlier, especially Hellenistic, models, but *The Byzantine Theocracy* does not approach the topic in depth. In *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background*, Francis Dvornik gives the issue its due merit. Dvornik begins his study of Early and Christian and Byzantine kingship with a vast survey of “Oriental Ideas on Kingship” in Egypt and Mesopotamia, among the “Aryan Hittites and Near Eastern Semites,” and in Iran. He attaches great importance to his overview of “Hellenistic Political Philosophy” and “Jewish Political Philosophy and the Messianic Idea,” and he ultimately argues that the “Eusebian theory” is really a Christian version of much older Hellenistic conceptions of “divine monarchy” in which the king is regarded as a “copy of God’s perfection.”¹¹

Dvornik also shows that while Constantine I and later emperors primarily embraced Hellenistic models of divine kingship, their image was also influenced by Jewish traditions and Roman custom. Panegyrists called Constantine I the “new David” and “new Solomon;” fourth century Greek authors used epithets comparing Constantine with Classical heroes;¹² and Christian subjects, including Church Fathers,

⁹ Runciman, 23.

¹⁰ Runciman, 161.

¹¹ Francis Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background*, (Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1966), 616.

¹² Comparisons between Byzantine emperors and both Classical and Biblical heroes continued in panegyrics throughout Byzantine history. See, for example, Dimiter Angelov, *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204-1330*, (Cambridge University Press, 2007), 86-90.

accepted the pagan tradition of performing *proskynesis* before the emperor's image.¹³ Constantine also closely identified himself with the "invincible sun," an ancient symbol that could be embraced by both Christian and pagan subjects.¹⁴ These practices would continue under subsequent Christian emperors.

Thus Dvornik contributes to scholarship on Byzantine political thought by showing the influence of ancient Near Eastern models on "Christian Hellenism" and by demonstrating that early Byzantine emperors legitimized themselves with a diverse array of images and arguments borrowing from many Near Eastern traditions. More recent works on Byzantine political theory have chosen much narrower frameworks of analysis than Dvornik's sweeping survey. For example, in *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204-1330*, Dimiter Angelov shows that while "the imperial idea....including the central tenet of the sacral nature of the emperor's authority, granted to him by God," remained dominant in official propaganda in late Byzantium,¹⁵ both official propagandists and private intellectuals adapted their conceptions of the imperial office to changing circumstances, namely Byzantium's loss of power and territory. Official propagandists placed greater emphasis on Constantinople as the center of the world, implying that Byzantine claims to universal rule could derive from the capital city, even while rule over vast domains collapsed.¹⁶ Some private intellectuals departed from older models entirely. In the early fourteenth century Manuel Moschopoulos developed a concept of "government by oath and contract" which has been likened to that in Hobbes' *Leviathan*.¹⁷ Moschopoulos' "secular" theory was a direct assault on the concept of the emperor as *divine* king.

Another recent work, Gilbert Dagron's *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium*, is a real capstone of previous research on the place of the emperor in Byzantine political thought. There Dagron revisits the topic of Caesaropapism and argues that

¹³ Dvornik, 655.

¹⁴ Dvornik, 631.

¹⁵ Dimiter Angelov, *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204-1330*, (Cambridge University Press, 2007), 417.

¹⁶ Angelov, 104, 418-419.

¹⁷ Angelov, 310, 321-326.

...‘Caesaropapism’ was an offensive word, an anachronism which wrongly projected on to the East the western notion of papacy, and on to the middle ages a separation of powers unthinkable before the modern period.¹⁸

Ultimately, Dagron sees the concept of Caesaropapism as a polemical term developed by Early Modern Protestant intellectuals who sought to attack “both the pope who arrogated to himself political power and the lay sovereigns who assumed responsibility for religious problems.”¹⁹ Moreover he argued that the Byzantines constructed the imperial office on the basis of “models” far more than theory. These models were diverse, but prominent among them were king-priests of the Old Testament, notably David and Melchizedek. According to Dagron, the roles of priest and king were never entirely differentiated in Byzantium. Leo III had once asserted “I am emperor and priest.”²⁰ While the phrase was dropped under the Macedonian emperors in the wake of the end of iconoclasm,²¹ the concept that the Byzantine emperors “were invested with a mission to administer this twofold heritage, Davidic and Levitic,” never departed from the Byzantine imagination.²²

In sum, the Byzantine emperor was, above all, “the image of God on earth,” but he could also be like unto Alexander and the Classical heroes, “the invincible sun,” King David, and the king-priest Melchizedek. He was always the *basileus* of all Christians; at times he could even also be a ruling “priest.” The emperor’s image and epithets were diverse and multi-faceted, and Byzantine authors employed different combinations according to time and political circumstances.

The Place of the Sultan in Ottoman Political Thought

Christian authors of the age of Constantine were able to re-theorize the concept of Hellenistic kingship within a Christian framework, though the authors of the New Testament had no conception of *temporal* Roman Christian kingship and had not

¹⁸ Gilbert Dagron, *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium*, Trans. Jean Birrell, (Cambridge University Press, 2003), 293.

¹⁹ Dagron, 283.

²⁰ Dagron, 158.

²¹ Dagron, 218.

²² Dagron, 318.

offered any models or commentary on it. For Sunni Muslims, however, Muhammad and the early Caliphs always served as precedents of political rulers of the Muslim community. Moreover, Hanafi jurists specifically comment on the place of a Muslim ruler in society.

In *Ebu'S-Su'ud: The Islamic Legal Tradition*, Colin Imber describes how Hanafi jurists crafted a very pragmatic definition of the ruler as “a person who successfully takes and holds power.”²³ They considered the ruler to be essential because he enforces the law, and they argued, in reverse, that whoever has the power to enforce the law could be a legitimate ruler. Hanafi law, however, delineates a rather “minimal role”²⁴ for this ruler. According to Imber, the jurists considered the ruler to be “exclusively responsible for [the law’s] implementation in only four area: Friday prayer, the infliction of the fixed penalties (*hudud*), alms, and the levying of the fifth (*khums*), a tax...levied on war booty.”²⁵ He was also called to participate in holy war against non-Muslims, but so were all other Muslims. Taken in sum, the jurists conceived of a ruler whose function was merely “to collect the juristically-determined taxes, and to disburse them for juristically determined charitable purposes.”²⁶

The limited role of the ruler in such a system contradicted drastically with the importance of the sultanate in Ottoman society. The primary unifying principle of the vast Ottoman Empire was, in fact, always the sultan and his imperial dynasty, from the empire’s humble beginnings as a frontier *beylik* until the twentieth century. In this way the Ottomans differed from the Roman and Byzantine Empires, in which the state survived multiple changes of dynasties.²⁷ Thus Ottoman theorists needed to develop ways to aggrandize their sultan and to legitimize broad powers without contradicting the sacred law.

One author who achieves such a balance is Dursun Beg, who spent forty years working in the service of the Ottoman state as a scribe and who published a history of

²³ Colin Imber, *Ebu'S-Su'ud: The Islamic Legal Tradition*, (Stanford University Press, 1997), 67.

²⁴ Imber, *Ebu'S-Su'ud*, 72.

²⁵ Imber, *Ebu'S-Su'ud*, 67.

²⁶ Imber, *Ebu'S-Su'ud*, 73.

²⁷ See Metin Kunt, “State and Sultan up to the Age of Süleyman: Frontier Principality to World Empire,” 4, in *Süleyman the Magnificent and His Age: The Ottoman Empire in the Early Modern World*, Ed. Metin Kunt and Christine Woodhead, (London: Longman, 1995).

Sultan Mehmed II's reign, the *Târîh-i Ebü'l-Feth*, in 1488.²⁸ In his introduction Dursun Beg seeks to understand the place of the sultanate in a divinely established "world order."²⁹ In a section of the introduction entitled, "A discourse regarding the needs of the people for the existence of the noble sultan, shadow of God,"³⁰ he argues that the sultan is a "necessity" because only he can protect society from "the mischief of the enmity of mankind" (6a),³¹ that is to say, from its own iniquity. In the same section he distinguishes between different types of law, including religious law, *sharia*, which was established by "the lawgiver who is prophet," and custom, for which various terms exist but which the Ottomans call *örf* (8a-8b).³² He argues that "in every age there is not a need for the existence of a lawgiver" as Islam "is sufficient for the whole human race 'until the last day'" and "another prophet is not needed. But in every age the existence of a sultan is necessary...if his administration comes to an end, human propagation will not find its most perfect form; it may even be extinguished entirely" (8b).³³ Thus Dursun Beg envisions a sultan who preserves order, protecting his subjects from "the gate of tyranny" and "path of oppression."³⁴ Dursun Beg's conception of the sultan as the enforcer of sacred law is consonant with the views of the jurists, but he goes much farther than them in glorifying the sultan as the "shadow of God" in a divinely established "world order."³⁵ Thus he borrows from what Halil İnalcık calls the ancient

²⁸ İnalcık, Halil, and Rhoads Murphey, *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, (Chicago: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1978), 11-12.

²⁹ "nizâm-ı âlem." Tursun Bey, *Târîh-i Ebü'l-Feth*, ed. Mertol Tulum, (İstanbul: Baha, 1977), 3, 12, etc.

³⁰ Tursun Bey, 10. "Güftâr Der Zikr-i İhtiyâc-ı Halk be Vücûd-ı Şerîf-i Pâdişâh-ı Zillu'llâh."

³¹ Tursun Bey, 10. "Husûmât-ı benî-nev'ün fesâdı."

³² Tursun Bey, 12.

³³ Tursun Bey, 12-13. "Hattâ şöyledür ki, her rûzgârda vücûd-ı şâri' hâcet değüldür; zîrâ ber-vaz'-ı İlâhî, meselâ dîn-i İslâm...*ilâ yevmi'l-kıyâm* kâffe-i enâm üzre kâfidür, bir peygamber dahî hâcet değüldür; ammâ her rûzgârda bir pâdişâhun vücûd-ı hâcettür...eğer anun tedbîri munkatî' olsa, bakâ-yı eşhâs ber-vech-i ekmel sûret bulmaz; belki bi'l-küllî fenâ bulur."

³⁴ Tursun Bey, 3. "bâb-ı cevri ve tarîk-ı zulmı."

³⁵ For further information on Dursun Beg's place in Ottoman and Islamic intellectual history, see Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler (15.-17. Yüzyıllar)*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998), 71-105. In his first chapter, Ocak describes "Ottoman official ideology," including discussion of the concept of the "world order." He both contextualizes Dursun Beg and notes his unique contributions to Ottoman political thought. Ocak, 87. See also Gottfried Hagen's "Legitimacy and World Order" in *Legitimizing the Order*.

“Near Eastern theory of state” that had also influenced Byzantines and Sassanids³⁶ and crafts a distinctly Ottoman articulation of the theory of the divine right of kings.

Another image that stemmed more directly from Islamic tradition that Ottoman authors employed to legitimize the sultanate was depiction of the sultans as holy warriors against non-Muslims. The first Turkish account of early Ottoman history, a poem written sometime between 1390 and 1410 by Ahmedî, emphasized the early Ottomans sultans’ victories in *gaza*, or holy war, above all other qualities. For example, he writes the following of Sultan Orhan:

He marched troops from every quarter
And pillaged the infidel night and day.
He enslaved the women and children;
They killed whoever remained, young and old.
The servants of religion raided the infidel,
From then on they called holy war “raid” (115-120).³⁷

The Ottomans would continue to evoke the image of sultan as holy warrior to rally support for the throne into the twentieth century.³⁸

Other Ottoman authors conceived of and legitimized the Ottoman sultanate in ways that were entirely unrelated to Islamic legal, historical, or theological tradition. The late fifteenth century Ottoman chronicler Neşri, for example, writes that the early Ottomans were sent on their mission of holy war by a legitimate Seljuk ruler, implying that they were the Seljuk’s successors and thus possessed legal right to Anatolian territory.³⁹ Moreover, he offers a genealogy of the Ottomans, descending all the way back to the Prophet Noah,⁴⁰ which shows their descent from Oğuz Han and implies a

³⁶ Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age, 1300-1600*, trans. Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), 68.

³⁷ Ahmedî, *Tevârîh-i Mülûk-i Âl-i Osman*, Ed. Çiftçioğlu Nihâl Atsız, (İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1949), 9. “Her yanadan yürüdü bir çeri,/Rûz u şeb târâc etdi kâfiri./Avrat, oğlan bulduğun etdi esîr;/Kırdılar bâkî ne var yigid ü pîr./Kâfir üzre akdılar a’vân-ı dîn;/Andan etdiler gazâ adın akın.”

³⁸ For a more thorough treatment of the development of early Ottoman *gazi* “ideology,” see Metin Kunt, “State and Sultan Up to the Age of Süleyman: Frontier Principality to World Empire,” 12, and Colin Imber, “Ideals and Legitimation in Early Ottoman History,” 138-145. Both are found in *Süleyman the Magnificent and His Age: The Ottoman Empire in the Early Modern World*, Ed. Metin Kunt and Christine Woodhead.

³⁹ Mehmed Neşri, *Kitâb-ı Cihan-Nümâ*, Ed. Faik Reşit Unat and Mehmed A. Köymen, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1995), 51-53. See also Imber, “Ideals and Legitimation in Early Ottoman History,” 146.

⁴⁰ Neşri, 55-57.

right to rule all Oğuz Turkish peoples.⁴¹ Like the Orthodox Christian Byzantines, Muslim Ottoman authors also praised their sultans with likenesses to pagan rulers of the Classical past. Ahmedî, for example, likens Süleyman Çelebi to both the great Sassanid king Nuşirevan, a non-Muslim, and to the caliph Ömer (604),⁴² while Dursun Beg likens Mehmed to Alexander the Great by making reference to the great ruler of Koranic lore, Dhool Karnain.⁴³ The Ottoman sultans also retained some titles and customs of the *khans* of the Turco-Mongolian monarchic tradition throughout their history.⁴⁴

With Sultan Mehmed II's conquest of Constantinople in 1453 came rich new possibilities for glorifying and legitimizing the throne. During his reign, the Ottoman Empire transformed from a frontier *beylik* to an intercontinental empire. Henceforth Ottoman sultans could rightfully count themselves as heirs to the Roman Caesars, or *Kayser-i Rum*, in Ottoman Turkish.⁴⁵ This was a claim accepted by many foreigners, ranging from sycophantic Greeks and Italians at Mehmed II's court⁴⁶ to Mughal chroniclers of the sixteenth century.⁴⁷ As a matter of fact, Mehmed II's ambitions extended beyond the confines of former Byzantine lands, known to the Ottomans as *Rum*. He hoped, rather, to conquer all old territories of the Roman Empire, or even of the world, and he consciously held Alexander the Great, whose life story he knew from both Greek and Turkish accounts, as his model.⁴⁸ Thus Mehmed II began to craft a new imperial image for the Ottomans, and he used architectural projects and a new court ceremonial as two means of projecting this image. These mediums came together in the

⁴¹ Imber, *Ebu 'S-Su 'ud*, 73-74.

⁴² Ahmedî, 23.

⁴³ Tursun Bey, 3.

⁴⁴ For discussion of this tradition's importance in influencing Ottoman customs of dynastic succession, see Joseph F. Fletcher, "Turco-Mongolian Monarchic Tradition in the Ottoman Empire," *Studies on Chinese and Islamic Inner Asia*, Ed. Beatrice Forbes Manz, (Hampshire: Variorum, 1995), 236-251.

⁴⁵ Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, "Sultan as Emperor: Ottoman Rulers in the Eyes of their Non-Muslim Subjects," 2.

⁴⁶ Julian Raby, "A Sultan of Paradox: Mehmet the Conqueror as a Patron of the Arts," *The Oxford Art Journal*, 5.1 (1982), 6.

⁴⁷ Naimur Rahman Faruqi, *Mughal-Ottoman Relations: A Study of Political and Diplomatic Relations between Mughal India and the Ottoman Empire, 1556-1748*, (Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1989), 200.

⁴⁸ Gülrü Necipoğlu, *Architecture, Ceremonial, and Power: The Topkapı Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991), 11-12. See also Raby, 6.

imperial grandeur of Mehmed's Topkapı Palace, an edifice with views of both Asia and Europe suitable for the "Sultan of the Two Continents and Emperor of the Two Seas."⁴⁹

Other bases of Ottoman legitimacy and self aggrandizement developed only in the sixteenth century. Sultan Selim I's capture of the Hejaz in 1517 earned the Ottoman sultans right to the title "Servitor of the Two Sacred Precincts." Moreover, the rise of the Shiite Safavid Empire prompted the Ottomans to begin presenting themselves as "defenders of the faith...against infidelity and heresy." Finally, during Süleyman's reign competition with the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V led the sultanate to embrace the ancient Islamic title of Caliph, which could imply Ottoman leadership over all Muslims, just as Charles declared himself universal leader of all Christians.⁵⁰ The term caliph had been used in early Islamic history for successive leaders of the Islamic community after Muhammad, including the four "rightly guided Caliphs" and the leaders of the Umayyads and of the Abbasids. Though lacking the right to claim the title according to "mainstream Sunni theory," the term was sometimes used loosely as an honorific for Ottoman sultans in the fifteenth century.⁵¹ During Süleyman's reign, however, the Ottoman intellectual Ebu'S-Su'ud resurrected the term's implication of "claim to divine right or to supreme sovereignty over the entire Muslim community,"⁵² while the famous Grand Vizier Lütü Paşa argued that many sultans were also Caliphs, but Süleyman was the "Supremem Imam, who is the highest Sultan."⁵³

In sum, some Ottoman intellectuals writing between the years 1453 and 1600, including Dursun Beg and Ebu'S-Su'ud, conceived of their sultan as the "shadow of God" who ruled primarily by divine right. Like the Byzantines, however, the Ottoman "*kayser-i Rum*" was also identified with heroes of the Classical past and legitimized with a diverse array of arguments and images which Ottoman authors used or rejected, emphasized or de-emphasized, in accordance with the times and political context.

⁴⁹ Inscription on the Imperial Gate of Topkapı Palace, as quoted by Necipoğlu, 13.

⁵⁰ Imber, *Ebu'S-Su'ud*, 74-75.

⁵¹ Imber, *Ebu'S-Su'ud*, 103-104.

⁵² Imber, *Ebu'S-Su'ud*, 103.

⁵³ Hamilton A.R. Gibb, "Lütü Paşa on the Ottoman Caliphate," *Oriens* 15 (1962): 293. See also Feridun M. Emecen, *Yavuz, Sultan Selim*, (İstanbul: Yitik Hazine, 2010): 321-328.

A Deep Reservoir of Epithets and Images

Karateke is right to differentiate between concepts of “normative” and “tolerated” legitimacy. While some of the Greek authors I will discuss in this thesis were born under Byzantine rule, others lived their entire lives under the Ottomans. In both empires, however, a primary identity of the ruler, be he Byzantine *basileus* or Ottoman *padişah*, rested on his status as a viceroy of God who upheld holy law and protected the empire against non-believers and heretics. Thus it is natural that many Christian subjects, including several of the authors under discussion, could not accept the legitimacy of Muslim Ottomans who regarded their Christian subjects as “nonbelievers.” Others accepted the Ottomans out of practical necessity and because it was God’s will that they rule. But as Karateke wrote, they could never accept any Muslim sultan as “*the* ruler sent to us by God.”

Nonetheless it remained possible, as we shall see at the end of this thesis, for a Greek author to plumb the deep reservoir of epithets and images that constituted the Near Eastern tradition of political philosophy to offer a “normative” theory of Ottoman legitimacy. This is due in part to the “secular”—or, at least, non-Christian—nature of Classical references and models. Anthropologist Talal Asad, among others, warns against projecting a compartmentalized definition of religion, one influenced by post-Reformation European history, back onto the medieval and Early Modern past.⁵⁴ Nonetheless, the prestige of the Classical Greek literary tradition offered Orthodox Christian intellectuals modes of thinking and writing about their existence under the Ottomans in ways that allowed for an escape from monotheistic divisions between “believers” and “non-believers.” While dichotomization between “religious” and “secular” authors is anachronistic, differentiation between “Classical” and “Christian” literary identities is not. The Ottomans would always be “nonbelievers” to authors who analyzed their world only through religious lenses, but they could be meritorious heroes

⁵⁴ See Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reason of Power in Christianity and Islam*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).

to an author who was willing to borrow from Classical tradition or from other strains of ancient Near Eastern thought.

As we saw above, both the Byzantine and Ottoman traditions of political philosophy were eclectic and flexible, manipulated variously depending on context. I will begin this thesis by describing authors for whom it was not flexible enough to embrace an Islamic sultan. We will see by the end, however, that others flexed their literary muscles and applied their imaginations towards a defense of the “Grand Turk” crafted from ancient Near Eastern literary tropes and analogies.

Chapter II: The Ottomans as Illegitimate Rulers

Of the nine authors under discussion in this thesis, four considered Ottoman rule to be illegitimate. Two of these authors, Doukas and Sphrantzes, wrote in the fifteenth century, while the other two, Melissourgos-Melissenos and an anonymous author, wrote in the sixteenth century. Some of these authors offer clearer views than others into their opinions about the legitimacy of the Ottoman sultanate. Doukas, for example, directly contrasts the hereditary “kingship” of the Byzantines with the “tyranny” of the house of Osman. Melissourgos-Melissenos, on the other hand, offers little explicit commentary, but it can nonetheless be inferred from his *Chronicon Maius* and from his own biography that he could not regard Muslim rule as legitimate because of the religious divide.

Although all of these chronicles treat Ottoman history in some capacity, they stand within disparate Greek-history traditions. Doukas’ chronicle is a late example of Byzantine chronicle-writing, focusing on the fall of the Byzantine Empire. Sphrantzes’ work, on the other hand, is the personal memoir of a Byzantine court official. Melissourgos-Melissenos did not write his own chronicle. Rather, he expanded on Sphrantzes’ work to produce a much longer version. He borrows from many genres in his writing, including a defense of Orthodoxy against attacks made by Catholics and Muslims and even a section on natural science, explaining comets and earthquakes. The sixteenth century anonymous chronicler weaves together elements of three traditions, including passages focusing on the Palaiologoi, on the Ottomans, and on ecclesiastical affairs. All four authors write in a mixed Greek language, utilizing both archaic and vernacular registers. None of them consistently write in an archaic Greek style at the level of Chritovoulos, for instance.

This chapter analyses these authors in roughly chronological order, beginning with Doukas, who probably died around 1462, then moving on to Sphrantzes, Melissourgos-Melissenos, and finally the undated anonymous chronicler. Common themes run throughout these works, most notably, that the Byzantines lost to the Ottomans as divine punishment for their sins. As we shall see, the fatalism of these authors does not lead to “tolerated legitimacy.” These authors did consider the Ottomans to be a punishment that they had to endure, but this did not seem to imply belief in the legitimacy of their rule.

Doukas and his History

Though Doukas’ baptismal name and birthplace are unknown, he is known to have descended from the famous Doukas family and to have been the grandson of Michael Doukas, a supporter of John VI Kantakouzenos who fled from Constantinople to the court of a Turkish emir at Aydın in 1345.⁵⁵ Like his grandfather, the historian Doukas was no supporter of the Palaiologoi. He did not even consider the last Byzantine emperor, Constantine XI Palaiologos, to be fully legitimate, referring to John VIII Palaiologos as “the last emperor of the Romans.”⁵⁶ But unlike his grandfather, antipathy to the Palaiologoi did not translate into sympathy for the Turks. Instead, Doukas demonstrates pro-Latin sympathies. He was a confirmed Unionist and blames anti-Unionists for the fall of Constantinople. He himself worked for the Genoese for much of his life in New Phokaia and on Lesbos.⁵⁷

Doukas’ views on the legitimacy of Ottoman rule are evident from both explicit comments and from his ways of describing the Ottomans. I will begin with his general

⁵⁵ Alice-Mary Talbot, “Doukas,” *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Vol. 1, (Oxford University Press, 1991), 656.

⁵⁶ Doukas, *Historia Byzantina*, Ed. Immanuel Bekkerus, (Bonn: Impensis, 1834), 188. “καταλείψας τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ τῷ ὑστάτῳ βασιλεῖ τῶν Ρωμαίων.”

⁵⁷ Nevra Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins: Politics and Society in the Late Empire*, (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 9-10.

views about the Ottomans, Islam, and individual sultans, then discuss explicit references to the question of legitimacy and his thoughts on the reasons for Byzantine suffering.

In general, Doukas expresses unrestrained loathing for the Ottomans and for their religion. In addition to individual attacks on sultans, Doukas generally describes “the Turks” as being dissolute and enemies of Christians. For example, after mentioning a marriage arrangement between Orhan and Kantakouzenos’ daughter, Doukas writes,

For this people is unrestrained and raging like no other, debauched beyond all races and unappeasable in its dissoluteness. For it is so enflamed that it does not stop itself from intercourse, natural and unnatural, with females, males, and brute animals, without restraint or temperance. And these [people of] this insolent and inhuman nation, if [one] takes hold of a Greek woman, or an Italian, or a woman from any other race, captive or defector, they caress her as if she were an Aphrodite or Semele. But they are nauseated by a woman of their own race and language as if she were a bear or hyena.⁵⁸

Elsewhere he writes about the ultimate “design of the Turks,” stating

From here I will begin to describe the ancient design of the Turks, which is preserved even until now, and through which they vigorously oppose Christians and raise up trophies against them and have been allotted to be ever victorious like no other people....For the nation of the Turks [is], like no other, fond of rape and injustice.⁵⁹

In other passages he frequently and categorically refers to the Ottomans as “the impious” and as “enemies of Christ,”⁶⁰ and he describes Islam as the “unlawful injunctions” of Muhammad.⁶¹

Thus Doukas is unambiguous about his general anti-Ottoman biases, regarding the Turks as lecherous and rapacious enemies of Christians, and considering their religion to be “impious” and “unlawful.” His opinions about individual sultans were also

⁵⁸ Doukas, 34. “καὶ γὰρ ἀκράτητον τὸ ἔθνος αὐτὸ καὶ οἰστρομανὲς ὥς οὐδὲ ἐν τῶν πασῶν γενῶν, ἀκόλαστον ὑπὲρ πάσας φυλὰς καὶ ἀκόρεστον ἀσωτίαις. τοσοῦτον γὰρ πυροῦται ὅτι καὶ κατὰ φύσιν καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ἐν θηλείαις, ἐν ἄρρεσιν, ἐν ἀλόγοις ζώοις ἀδεῶς καὶ ἀκρατῶς μιγνύμενον οὐ παύεται. καὶ ταῦτα τὸ ἀναιδὲς καὶ ἀπάνθρωπον ἔθνος εἰ Ἑλληνίδα ἢ Ἰταλὴν ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ ἑτερογενῆ προσλάβηται ἢ αἰχμάλωτον ἢ αὐτόμολον, ὥς Ἀφροδίτην τινὰ ἢ Σεμέλην ἀσπάζονται, τὴν ὁμογενῆ δὲ καὶ αὐτόγλωττον ὥς ἄρκτον ἢ ὕαιναν βδελύττονται.”

⁵⁹ Doukas, 134-135. “Ἀρξομαι δὲ ἐντεῦθεν τὴν ἐκ πάλαι γενομένην παρὰ τῶν Τούρκων ἐπίνοιαν διηγῆσασθαι, ἣ καὶ ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν σώζεται, καὶ δι’ αὐτῆς ἀνδρείως τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐφίστανται καὶ τροπαῖα κατ’ αὐτῶν διεγείρουσι καὶ ἐς αἰὲν τὴν νικῶσαν ὥς οὐκ ἄλλο γένος κεκλήρωνται....ἦν γὰρ τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Τούρκων, ὥς οὐκ ἄλλο, φιλάρπαγον καὶ φιλάδικον. πρὸς ἄλληλα γὰρ ἦν. εἰ δὲ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν, τί χρή καὶ λέγειν;”

⁶⁰ E.g., Doukas, 55. “ταῖς ἀσεβέσι καὶ χριστομάχοις.”

⁶¹ Doukas, 17. “τὰς ἀθέσμους αὐτοῦ ἐντολὰς.”

generally negative in the extreme, but Doukas did praise some individuals. Like most Greek chroniclers of the period, for example, he offers positive commentary on Sultan Mehmed I. He attributes, for example, Mehmed's peaceful death to his friendship with the Byzantine emperors and his sympathy towards Christians.⁶² Likewise he believed that Sultan Murad died a peaceful death because he had ultimately been a good man who "hated war [and] loved peace,"⁶³ though he also criticizes Murad elsewhere.⁶⁴ His attacks on other sultans, however, are severe. He describes Bayezid I as an archenemy of Christians who "did not sleep, spending his nights in deliberations and machinations against the rational flocks of Christ."⁶⁵ Doukas accuses Musa of being a cannibal who feasted upon Christian cadavers,⁶⁶ and he states that Musa's Turkish troops were inherently inferior to Byzantine ones, stating that "for one Roman, three Turks fell."⁶⁷ According to him, Süleyman Çelebi was cowardly in battle⁶⁸ and a debauched drunk.⁶⁹ He loathed Mehmed II most of all and repeatedly refers to him as the "Antichrist,"⁷⁰ considering him to be the ultimate "enemy of the Cross."⁷¹

Doukas is exceptionally explicit in conveying his belief in the illegitimacy of Ottoman rule, as he borrows technical vocabulary from the Classical Greek literary tradition to contrast Byzantines and Ottomans. Whereas Herodotus is often considered to be the "father of history," Thukydides is often regarded as the first political scientist. In the fifth century BCE Thukydides described the rise of "tyranny" in Greek city-states by stating

And as Greece became more powerful and to acquire still more money than before, tyrannies were established in many cities, as revenues became greater, whereas before there had been hereditary monarchies [based] upon stated prerogatives (I:13).⁷²

⁶² Doukas, 124.

⁶³ Doukas, 228. "μισῶν τὰς μάχας, ἀγαπῶν τὴν εἰρήνην."

⁶⁴ Doukas, 207-208.

⁶⁵ Doukas, 17. "ἄγρυπνος καὶ διανυκτερεύων ἐν τε βουλαῖς καὶ μηχανουργίαις κατὰ τῶν Χριστοῦ λογικῶν προβάτων."

⁶⁶ Doukas, 92.

⁶⁷ Doukas, 93. "καὶ εἰς ἓνα Ῥωμαῖον τρεῖς ἐπιπτον Τοῦρκοι."

⁶⁸ Doukas, 85.

⁶⁹ Doukas, 89.

⁷⁰ E.g., Doukas, 232, 238, etc. "ἀντίχριστος."

⁷¹ Doukas, 232. "ὁ ἐχθρὸς τοῦ σταυροῦ."

⁷² Thukydides, *Historiae* (Greek Text), The Perseus Digital Library, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/. "δυνατωτέρας δὲ γιγνομένης τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ τῶν χρημάτων τὴν κτῆσιν ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον ποιουμένης τὰ πολλὰ τυραννίδες ἐν ταῖς

Here he contrasts “kingship,” or βασιλεία in Greek, which is based “upon stated prerogatives,” with “tyranny,” or τυραννίς, which is not.

Throughout his *History*, Doukas also uses similar vocabulary to contrast Byzantines and Ottomans. He always uses, for example, the word βασιλεύς, or “emperor,” to refer to the Byzantine potentate, whereas he generally uses the term τύραννος, or “tyrant,” to refer to Ottoman sultans.⁷³ These terms are often placed in juxtaposition, hinting at belief in the legitimacy of Byzantine rule and the illegitimacy of Ottoman rule.⁷⁴

In one passage, he even echoes Thukydides’ language exactly. Doukas believed in a prophecy predicting that the Ottoman dynasty would end along with that of the Palaiologoi, and that the Byzantines would someday rule again. While explaining this prophecy, he incidentally gives away his views of the inherent character of Byzantine and Ottoman rule:

These things which I write [about the aftermath of] the fall of the City, I should not write. For it was not fitting for me to record the victories and exploits of the impious tyrant and implacable enemy and destroyer of our people. But the thing that persuades me to write is this which I am going to explain. When I was still young, I learned from some honorable old men that the end of the *tyranny* of the Ottomans will be [but briefly] preceded by the end of the *kingship* of the Palaiologoi. For Osman began in *tyranny* and Michael Palaiologos in *kingship*, Michael a little beforehand, and Osman a little later, [continuing] into the days of his son Andronikos Palaiologos. And it was in the days of Michael that Osman ruled as tyrant, and a thieving one [at that]. Likewise it [will be] that the end of the emperors and of the City will happen first, then that of the Ottomans. For it happened that Michael took auguries at that time [to learn whether or not] his son would inherit kingship when he died. For he was censured by common knowledge of having seized kingship unjustly, having blinded the heir, and myriad curses fell upon his head and upon his lineage. And so [as] an oracular response the unintelligible cry “*mamaimi*” was emitted. The seer explained it by saying, “As many letters are in the unintelligible word, that many emperors will rule from your seed, and then kingship will withdraw away from the City and from your people.” And so we who have reached this latest period of time and who have seen the awful and terrifying threat to our people come to be, we dreamingly await deliverance. Beseeching to the utmost with overflowing longing, God, who chastises and cures again, and hoping for the things predicted

πόλεσι καθίσταντο, τῶν προσόδων μειζόνων γιγνομένων (πρότερον δὲ ἦσαν ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς γέρασι πατρικαὶ βασιλεῖαι).”

⁷³ E.g. Doukas, 314, 335, etc.

⁷⁴ E.g., Doukas, 47. “ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ὁρῶν τοῦ τυράννου τὸ ἀποκάλυπτον καὶ αὐθαδές...”

by pious men, for succession, we write these things that were done by the tyrant after the threat of God.⁷⁵

In this passage, Doukas directly contrasts the “*tyranny* of the Ottomans” (τυραννίς) with the “*kingship* of the Palaiologoi” (βασιλεία), a juxtaposition that evokes Thukydides’ passage. The meaning of the word “tyranny” varied subtly throughout the history of Greek literature, developing more negative connotations after the Classical period. Here it is likely that it both carried later Greek negative connotations of the English word “tyrant” and Thukydides’ definition of a tyrant as a ruler lacking “stated prerogatives.” Here Doukas conveys that he not only regards the Ottomans to be illegitimate, but he also believes that the end of their rule is fated and imminent.

Why, then, are the Byzantines forced to suffer passing hardship at the hands of the Ottomans? To answer this, Doukas quotes the *Lamentations of Jeremiah*: “Our fathers have sinned, and are not; and we have borne their iniquities. Servants have ruled over us: there is none that doth deliver us out of their hand” (5:7-8).⁷⁶ Throughout his text,

⁷⁵ Doukas, 318-319. Emphasis added. “Ταῦτα ἃ γράφω μετὰ τὴν τῆς πόλεως ἄλωσιν, οὐκ ἔξεστί μοι γράφειν· οὐ γὰρ ἦν πρέπον χρονογραφεῖν μοι νίκας καὶ ἀνδραγαθήματα τυράννου δυσσεβοῦς καὶ ἐχθροῦ ἀσπόνδου καὶ ὀλετήρος τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν. ἀλλὰ τὸ πείσαν μοι γράφειν ἐστὶ τοῦτο ὃ λέξων ἔρχομαι. ἔμαθον παρὰ τινων γερόντων τιμίων ἀνδρῶν ἔτι νέος ὢν ὅτι τὸ τέλος τῆς τυραννίδος τῶν Ὀθμάνων ἐστὶ ὁμοῦ φθάσας σὺν τῷ τέλει τῆς βασιλείας Παλαιολόγων. ὁμοῦ γὰρ ἤρξαντο ὁ Ὀθμάν ἐν τυραννίδι καὶ Μιχαὴλ ὁ Παλαιολόγος ἐν βασιλείᾳ, πρὸ ὀλίγου μὲν ὁ Μιχαὴλ, μετ’ ὀλίγον δὲ ὁ Ὀθμάν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἀνδρονίκου τοῦ Παλαιολόγου. ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ Μιχαὴλ τυραννῶν ὁ Ὀθμάν, πλὴν ληστρικῶς. κατὰ τοῦτο ἐπρόκειτο καὶ τὸ τῶν βασιλέων καὶ τῆς πόλεως πέρας προλαβὼν γενέσθαι, εἴτα τὸ τῶν Ὀθμάνων. ἔτυχε γὰρ ὁ Μιχαὴλ οἰωνοσκοπήσας τότε εἰ τὴν βασιλείαν κληρονομήσει ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ τελευτήσας αὐτός· ἐλέγχετο γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ συνειδότος ἀδίκως τὴν βασιλείαν δραξάμενος, τυφλώσας τὸν κληρονόμον, καὶ μυρίους ἀφορισμοὺς κατὰ κεφαλῆς δεξάμενος καὶ κατὰ τῆς τοῦ γένους σειρᾶς. τὸ μαντεῖον οὖν φωνὴν ἄσημον ἔξερεύξατο μαμαιμί. ὁ δὲ μάντις ἐξηγούμενος ἔλεγεν, ὅσα στοιχεῖα ἐν τῇ ἀσήμενι λέξει τυγχάνουσιν, τοσοῦτοι ἐκ τῆς σῆς σπορᾶς βασιλεῖς βασιλεύσουσιν, καὶ τότε ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους σου ἀρθήσεται.’ τοῦτο οὖν ἡμεῖς οἱ ἐν τῇ ὑστάτῃ τοῦ χρόνου φορᾶ φθάσαντες, καὶ ἰδόντες τὴν ἀπαίσιον καὶ φοβερὰν ἀπειλὴν τὴν γενηθεῖσαν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ γένει, ὀνειροπολοῦντες ἐκδεχόμεθα τὴν ἀνάρρυσιν, καὶ δι’ ἐπιθυμίας εἰς ἄκρος ζεούσης ἰκετεύοντες τὸν παιδεύοντα καὶ πάλιν ἰώμενον θεόν, καὶ τὰ προρρηθέντα παρὰ τινων εὐλαβῶν ἀνδρῶν εἰς ἐκδοχὴν ἐλπίζοντες, γράφομεν καὶ τὰ μετὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπειλὴν παρὰ τοῦ τυράννου γεγόμενα.”

⁷⁶ *The Holy Bible: Containing the Old and New Testaments, King James Version*, (New York: American Bible Society, 1973), 736. Doukas, 310.

Doukas states that the Byzantines suffer because of wrong-doing, lamenting that they face “total abandonment...by the righteous-judging God because of our sins.”⁷⁷ Doukas compares dispersal of Greeks from Constantinople to the Babylonian Captivity of the Hebrew Testament⁷⁸ and likens the Ottomans to the Chaldeans.⁷⁹ To him, Mehmed II is a new Nebuchadnezzar⁸⁰ who has come to punish God’s people. Doukas cannot defy the will of God, and he must accept the Ottomans fatalistically, like Hakan Karateke’s priest. But this does not imply a belief in the legitimacy of their rule. He believed that the days of punishment would end soon, and he awaited deliverance.

Georgios Sphrantzes and his Memoir

Doukas’ chronicle is incomplete. It ends abruptly in the midst of narrative about events that took place in 1462, prompting scholars to posit that he died around that time.⁸¹ Georgios Sphrantzes completed his *Memoir* not long afterwards. It documents events from 1413-1477 and was finished sometime in 1477 or 1478, soon before Sphrantzes died. It consists of a mixture of personal narrative and annalistic history and was written mostly in a colloquial Greek.⁸²

Like Doukas, Sphrantzes was an elite in late Byzantine society. Whereas Doukas served the Genoese, Sphrantzes was a courtier for the imperial family, serving Emperor Manuel II, and later his son Constantine XI. In 1430 he was assigned to be governor of Patras; in 1446, governor of Mistras; and in 1432, *protovestiarites*, or imperial bodyguard. He sometimes visited Ottoman rulers as an envoy, and he was captured along with his family when Constantinople fell in 1453.⁸³ His son and daughter became

⁷⁷ Doukas, 311. “στέναζον εἰς τὴν παντελῇ ἐγκατάλειπιν τὴν γενομένην ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ γενεᾷ παρὰ τοῦ δικαιοκρίτου θεοῦ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν.” See also, Doukas 24, 57, 135, 200, 221-222, etc.

⁷⁸ Doukas, 311.

⁷⁹ Doukas, 284-285.

⁸⁰ Doukas, 252.

⁸¹ Talbot, “Doukas,” 656.

⁸² Alice-Mary Talbot, “George Sphrantzes,” *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Vol. 3, (Oxford University Press, 1991), 1937.

⁸³ Talbot, “George Sphrantzes,” 1937.

slaves of Mehmed II, and both died soon after coming into his possession, one of disease and the other by execution. Sphrantzes ultimately left Ottoman domains, settled, and died in Venetian Corfu.⁸⁴

Sphrantzes' *Memoir* offers much less explicit evidence into his thoughts on the legitimacy of Ottoman rule than Doukas' *History*, but it can still be said with confidence that he could not regard them as legitimate replacers of Byzantine authority. This can be implied from his descriptions of Ottoman sultans, his views on their place in God's dealings with humanity, and from his deeply Orthodox Christian worldview.

Sphrantzes' discussion of the Ottomans alternates in tone. He uses the very neutral terms ἀμνηρᾶς (emir) and αὐθέντης (sovereign) as titles for Ottoman sultans, and he writes about Byzantine diplomatic relations with the Ottomans, in which he was often an active participant, with pragmatic detachment. He could not, however, accept in any way the concept of Ottomans ruling *in place* of the Byzantines—for him they could not be continuers of Byzantine rule. He considered Mehmed II to have “taken us prisoner and expelled [us] from Constantinople”⁸⁵ in contrast to other authors who viewed him as a patron of Christians after the conquest. It was, after all, literally true that his family was enslaved by him. He repeatedly describes the Ottomans as the “the impious,”⁸⁶ and he naturally had especially negative views about Mehmed II, regarding him as the “an enemy of Christians from childhood.”⁸⁷ Given the degree to which he suffered during his reign, however Sphrantzes' commentary on Mehmed II is restrained when compared to other authors, like Doukas.

Though he does not explicitly repeat it as a refrain like Doukas, Sphrantzes also implies that he believed that the fate of the Byzantines was a result of their sins. Of the last emperor Constantine, he writes:

Who [knew] of the fasts and supplications he made both himself and through priests that he paid, or of the care he showed to the poor, or of his promises to

⁸⁴ Necipoğlu, 9.

⁸⁵ Georgios Sphrantzes, *Memorii: 1401-1477*, Ed. Vasile Grecu, (Bucharest: Editio Academiae Rei Publicae Socialistae Romaniae, 1966), 2. “ὁ ὄγδοος Μεχέμετις, ὅς δὴ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἡχμαλώτευσεν καὶ ἐξέωσε τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως.”

⁸⁶ E.g. Sphrantzes, 14. “καὶ τὴν εἰς τὴν Δύσιν πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐκυρίευσεν.” See also Sphrantzes, 34, 58, 66, 116, 126, 146, etc.

⁸⁷ Sphrantzes, 76. “παιδόθεν ἐχθρὸς τῶν Χριστιανῶν.”

God for the Christians to be delivered from capture by the Turks? But God disregarded all of these things, for what sins, I know not...⁸⁸

At the end of his chronicle he even implies that his own ill health at life's end was just punishment for his own numerous sins,⁸⁹ further evidence of his understanding of causality.

Elsewhere he writes explicitly about how he understands the Ottomans' role in God's dealings with the Byzantine Christians. When writing about Ottoman incursions into the Morea, he states that he hoped that God "might enjoin his executioner, the emir, and let [the Christians of the Morea] live longer."⁹⁰ He goes on to explain,

For even he [the emir] has a place and post [in the eyes of] God, like his executioners for him, who fulfill his will and command, though they are hated and abominable.⁹¹

For Sphrantzes, the Ottoman sultan was no divinely appointed emperor; he was a divinely appointed killer.

For an author of the fifteenth century to make such religious reference does not necessarily imply deep religious sentiment, as such reference was literary convention of the time. Sphrantzes, however, reveals a religiosity that seems to run much deeper than the superficial trope that appears in other chronicles. Once when he was imprisoned while serving as an emissary, he prayed to Saint George, after which he saw a vision of deliverance. He writes that he was freed the following morning, and he seems to have fully believed in the intervention of the divine.⁹² He spent his last years as a monk, hoping, according to his memoir's conclusion, that the suffering he endured on earth would be enough to avert punishment after death.⁹³ The worldview he evinces is that of a genuinely pious Orthodox Christian. Could the Ottoman sultans, who he regarded as leaders of the "impious," as God's "executioners," really have political legitimacy in the

⁸⁸ Sphrantzes, 104. "Τὶς καὶ νηστείας καὶ δεήσεις ἐποιεῖτο καὶ δι' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ διὰ τῶν ἱερέων διδοὺς αὐτοῖς χρήματα, ἢ τοῖς πτωχοῖς πλείω ἐθεράπευσεν, ἢ ἐπαγγελίας ἐποιήσατο πλείους εἰς θεὸν εἰς τὸ ἐλευθερωθῆναι τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας τῶν Τουρκῶν; Ἀλλ' ὅμως πάντα ταῦτα μὲν παρεῖδε θεός, τίσι κρίμασιν, οὐκ οἶδα..."

⁸⁹ Sphrantzes, 144.

⁹⁰ Sphrantzes, 114. "...προστάξει δὲ καὶ τὸν δῆμιον αὐτοῦ ἀμνηρᾶν καὶ ἀφήσει αὐτοὺς ζῆσαι πλείονα χρόνον."

⁹¹ Sphrantzes, 114. "Τόπον γὰρ καὶ τάξιν ἔχει καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς θεόν, οἶαν οἱ αὐτοῦ δῆμοι πρὸς αὐτόν, οἵτινες πληροῦσι μὲν τῷ θελήματι καὶ τῇ προστάξει αὐτοῦ, εἰσὶ δὲ μισητοὶ καὶ ἀποτρόπαιοι."

⁹² Sphrantzes, 36-38.

⁹³ Sphrantzes, 144-146.

eyes of such a man? His writings imply that he accepted Ottoman suzerainty fatalistically, but he gives no evidence that this translated into a belief in political legitimacy of any kind.

Makarios Melissourgos-Melissenos and the *Chronicon Maius*

Any attempt to discern the sixteenth century churchman Makarios Melissourgos-Melissenos' views on any topic is hindered by the fact that he was a forger who left no works in his own name. Few details about his life are known, but it is attested that he was the bishop of Monemvasia in 1570, and that he entered into an argument with the metropolitan of Christianoupolis, a city in the Peloponnesus, concerning jurisdiction over another see. As evidence for his cause, he is said to have forged a Byzantine document. His *Chronicon Maius* is not an original text, but rather it is a much longer expansion of Sphrantzes' memoir. His reasons for writing are unclear, but it is noteworthy that Melissourgos-Melissenos (M.M.) embellished his own family history and fabricated ancestors for himself who fought and died heroically during the siege of Constantinople in 1453. The entertainment value of his work is high, and it was popular reading throughout Ottoman times.⁹⁴

M.M.'s *Chronicon Maius* differs from Sphrantzes' memoir most significantly in the following ways. Firstly, M.M. borrowed from the prologue of George Akropolites' thirteenth century history to craft an introduction in archaic Greek on the value of history. He writes about the origins of the Palaiologoi, offers summaries of Ottoman history which were entirely absent from Sphrantzes' work, and elaborates on information offered by Sphrantzes on Byzantine history from 1401-1412 and 1425-1448. M.M. also adds a very detailed description of the siege of Constantinople which was based in part on Bishop Leonard of Chios' Latin account.⁹⁵ Finally, he includes

⁹⁴ Marios Philippides, "Makarios Melissourgos-Melissenos," *Historians of the Ottoman Empire*, Ed. C. Kafadar, H. Karateke, C. Fleischer, www.ottomanhistorians.com, 2008.

⁹⁵ See *The Siege of Constantinople 1453: Seven Contemporary Accounts*, Trans. J.R. Melville Jones, (Amsterdam: Adolf Hakkert, 1972), 11-41.

many details about wars in the Morea, a letter attributed to Cardinal Bessarion, discourses on Islam and natural history, and a formal conclusion.⁹⁶

Considering that much of the *Chronicon Maius* is borrowed from Greek and Latin texts of the 13th and 15th centuries and that many original parts were crafted to flow in and out of Sphrantzes' narrative, it is difficult to find M.M.'s identity within the text, and it is not surprising that various passages imply different views on the legitimacy of the Ottoman sultanate. For example, in his section about the capture of Constantinople M.M. writes the following about Mehmed II:

Thus the villain, desiring *to act like* the emperor of the city, called the patriarch just as the Christian emperors had done...and when the patriarch came, the tyrant received him with great honor.⁹⁷

Throughout passages about the siege he writes negatively about the Ottomans, and in the above quote he implies that he could not regard Mehmed II as a true emperor of the city, like the Christian emperors had been, only as a false imitator.⁹⁸ In early parts of the chronicle, however, his tone is more neutral. During his passages on early Ottoman history in Book I, for example, he writes with no negative bias, and part of his account can even be interpreted as being record of a legitimizing discourse for the Ottomans aimed at Greek Christians.

M.M. records a tradition which asserts that the Ottoman sultans were actually descendants of the Komnenoi.⁹⁹ The story takes place during a campaign by Emperor John Komnenos in Anatolia. According to M.M., the emperor was accompanied by his nephew, John, and their army found itself poorly positioned when winter fell. All provisions, especially horses, became scarce. Thus the emperor decided to redistribute

⁹⁶ Marios Philippides, *The Fall of the Byzantine Empire: A Chronicle by Marios Philippides*, (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1980), 7-8.

⁹⁷ *Annales Georgii Phrantzae*, Ed. Immanuel Berrkerus, (Bonn: Impensis, 1838), 306. Emphasis added. Please note when this edition of the *Chronicon Maius* was published, it was believed to have been an original work by Georgios Sphrantzes, and thus its bears the erroneous title *Annales Georgii Phrantzae*. “Οὕτως δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ἀλιτῆριος θέλων ποιῆσαι ὡς βασιλεὺς τῆς πόλεως, καθὼς ἐποίουν καὶ οἱ Χριστιανοὶ βασιλεῖς, τὸν πατριάρχην προσεκαλέσατο....καὶ ἐλθόντος τοῦ πατριάρχου ἐδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ τύραννος μετὰ μεγάλης τιμῆς.”

⁹⁸ Please note that the above quote is *not* taken from Leonard of Chios' account.

⁹⁹ Another author who recounts this story linking the Ottomans to John Komnenos is Theodore Spandounes, who wrote a book on Ottoman history in Italian. See Theodore Spandounes, *On the Origin of the Ottoman Emperors*, Trans. Donald M. Nicol, (Cambridge University Press, 1997), 11.

the healthiest horses to the best cavalrymen, and he asked his nephew to dismount from his Arabian steed and to give it to an Italian soldier. M.M. goes on to write,

Filled with dejection and utterly boiling over with anger, [the emperor's nephew] fled to the Persians and became a deserter. The emir and all of the barbarians received him gladly and hospitably. Having given up his faith in Christ, he assumed the name Çelebi instead of John, and he took as a wife a daughter of the emir named Kamero. [The emir] gave a dowry to him, lands and estates, cities and lots of money....And he bore a son named Süleyman Shah by Kamero, and after educating him in Greek and Arabic wisdom, he was in all ways like his father, and the barbarians honored him greatly. In that place and in the whole region, there he settled and sat as sovereign....This man bore Ertuğrul, the father of Osman.¹⁰⁰

M.M. goes on to relate another story that depicts a Turkish ruler as Christian at heart. He writes that according to other authors, Çelebi was not Emperor John Komnenos' nephew, but another person with the same name. M.M. narrates that Sultan Azatines (Izzeddin), an Ottoman predecessor, was born of Christian parents, had received baptism, and became emir of the Turks. While ruling, he "observed in secret the ordained things of piety,"¹⁰¹ living as a crypto-Christian Turkish potentate.

After recounting these stories, M.M. abandons the topic in this way: "But whether it was in this way or in that way, let us leave these things. I pass the issue to the philomaths and to those who know the dispute well."¹⁰² He has no strong opinion about the truth or falsity of the stories and merely offers us a peak into a potential means of making Ottoman rule palatable to Christian subjects that does not seem to have been developed by later authors. These stories cannot be interpreted as M.M.'s *own* attempt to legitimize the Ottomans.

¹⁰⁰ *Annales Georgii Phrantzae*, 70-71. "αὐτὸς ἀθυμίας πλήρης καὶ βράζων θυμῷ ἄντικρυς γενόμενος, φυγὼν πρὸς Πέρσας αὐτόμολος γίνεται. ὃν καὶ ἀσμένως καὶ ἀσπασίως προσεδέξατο ὁ ἀμνηρᾶς καὶ πάντες οἱ βάρβαροι· καὶ τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ πίστιν ἐξομοσάμενος ἀντὶ Ἰωάννου Τζελεπῆς ὠνόμασται, καὶ τινα ὀνόματι Καμερῷ τοῦ ἀμνηρᾶ θυγατέρα γυναῖκα ἔλαβε, καὶ προῖκα ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τόπους καὶ χώρας καὶ πόλεις καὶ χρήματα πολλά....οὗτος δὲ γεννᾷ υἱὸν ὀνόματι Σωλιμάν-Σιάχ ἐκ τῆς Καμερῷ, καὶ παιδεύσας αὐτὸν Ἑλληνικῇ καὶ Ἀραβικῇ σοφίᾳ, κατὰ πάντα εἰκῶς ἦν τῷ πατρί, καὶ πλεῖστα ἠύλαβοῦντο αὐτὸν οἱ βάρβαροι. καὶ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ καὶ πάσῃ τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ, ἔνθα τὴν κατοίκησιν ἐποιεῖτο, αὐθέντης καθίσταται....αὐτὸς γεννᾷ τὸν Ἐρτογρούλην πατέρα τοῦ Ὀθμάνου."

¹⁰¹ *Annales Georgii Phrantzae*, 72. "ὅς καὶ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ ἐτήρει τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας κυριώτερα."

¹⁰² *Annales Georgii Phrantzae*, 74. "Ὅμως μὲν, εἴτε οὕτως ἦν εἴτε οὕτως, ἐάσωμεν ταῦτα, καὶ τοῖς φιλομαθέσι καὶ τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσι τὴν κρίσιν..."

Thus, overall, M.M.'s section on the siege of Constantinople conveys anti-Ottoman sentiment, but his passages on early Ottoman history imply neutrality. He also includes a tract defending Orthodoxy against criticisms by Catholics and Muslims. This section, if it conveys M.M.'s actual opinion, implies that he would have been reluctant to offer full loyalty to a Muslim sovereign.

Unlike the other three authors under discussion in this chapter, M.M. does not blame the Byzantines' poor fortune on their sins. In a defense of Orthodoxy against Catholic claims that the Byzantines fell because of theological error, he notes that there seems to be no connection between power and piety, as sometimes the pious rule, whereas at other times they are ruled over.¹⁰³ Rather, he sees Byzantine ill-fortune as a *test* for the faithful.¹⁰⁴ His defense against Catholic claims is probably a direct response to Leonard of Chios' attack on Greek "iniquity," among others.¹⁰⁵

In his defense of Orthodoxy against Muslim criticisms, M.M. enters into a lengthy and severe anti-Islamic rant. He writes that Muhammad, unlike Jesus, is not testified by any prophets in the Hebrew Scripture.¹⁰⁶ He lambasts the alleged violence of Islam, writing that "Muhammad said, 'I did not come to grant the law through miracles, but through blade and sword.'" ¹⁰⁷ According to M.M. this means that Muhammad "teaches murder and rapine," and that his message cannot be from God.¹⁰⁸ He criticizes the Islamic vision of the afterlife, filled with "beautiful spas and houses and virgin women,"¹⁰⁹ and he regards Muhammad as someone "legislating fornication and virgin-violation" because of Islamic law regarding prisoners of war.¹¹⁰ He rhetorically asks, "Who is more profane than Muhammad?"¹¹¹ M.M. vigorously attacks the Islamic faith in a way that casts doubt on his ability to regard a Muslim potentate as legitimate.

¹⁰³ *Annales Georgii Phrantzae*, 312.

¹⁰⁴ *Annales Georgii Phrantzae*, 314.

¹⁰⁵ See *The Siege of Constantinople 1453: Seven Contemporary Accounts*, 12-15.

¹⁰⁶ *Annales Georgii Phrantzae*, 342.

¹⁰⁷ *Annales Georgii Phrantzae*, 344. "ὁ Μωάμεθ λέγει 'ἐγὼ οὐκ ἦλθον διὰ θαυμάτων δοῦναι τὸν νόμον, ἀλλὰ διὰ σπάθης καὶ ξίφους."

¹⁰⁸ *Annales Georgii Phrantzae*, 346. "φόνους πάντως καὶ ἀρπαγὰς διδάσκει."

¹⁰⁹ *Annales Georgii Phrantzae*, 347. "λουτρὰ καὶ οἴκους περικαλλεῖς καὶ γυναῖκας παρθένους."

¹¹⁰ *Annales Georgii Phrantzae*, 347. "ὁ γοῦν πορνείας καὶ παρθενοφορίας νομοθετῶν πᾶς ἀπὸ θεοῦ;"

¹¹¹ *Annales Georgii Phrantzae*, 359. "καὶ τίς ἀσεβέστερος τοῦ Μωάμεθ;"

The *Chronicon Maius* is an eclectic text based on disparate sources, and M.M.'s identity is difficult to uncover from within it. Evidence regarding the topic of this thesis is contradictory, but given that his defense against Orthodoxy was probably an original addition to the text, I would be inclined to say M.M. could not have accepted the legitimacy of the Ottoman sultanate because of his anti-Islamic biases. My claim would have been tenuous, however, had there not been other evidence from M.M.'s biography to support it.

In 1571 M.M. is known to have collaborated with Spanish agents to provide local support for the anti-Ottoman fleet. After the Battle of Lepanto, M.M. and his families continued seditious activities against the Ottomans, and when the western fleet departed from local waters, they boarded a Spanish ship and fled Ottoman domains. M.M. settled in Naples, where he completed his *Chronicon Maius*, and he died in 1585.¹¹²

Based on internal textual evidence alone, claims about M.M.'s views would need to be made cautiously. But given that he also revolted actively against Ottoman rule, it is safe to conclude that he did not consider their rule to be legitimate.

The Codex Oxoniensis-Lincolnsis¹¹³

Like Doukas, the anonymous author of the late sixteenth century *Codex Oxoniensis-Lincolnsis*, which was published and translated by Marios Philippides in *Emperors, Patriarchs, and Sultans of Constantinople, 1373-1513*, is not ambiguous about his views regarding the illegitimacy of Ottoman rule. But unlike Doukas, whose work is largely original, the anonymous author borrowed heavily from other sources, as he conspicuously alternates between distinct narrative traditions about Byzantine history, ecclesiastical history, and Ottoman history throughout his text. Nonetheless he impresses his own views and identity on borrowed source material in a much more consistent way than M.M. For example, the anonymous author consistently uses the

¹¹² Philippides, "Makarios Melissourgos-Melissenos,"

¹¹³ While all other quotes in this thesis are my own translations, those from the *Codex Oxoniensis-Lincolnsis* are taken from, Marios Philippides, *Emperors, Sultans, and Patriarchs of Constantinople, 1373-1513: An Anonymous Greek Chronicle of the Sixteenth Century*, (Brookline: Hellenic College Press, 1990).

terms αὐθέντης (sovereign) or σουλτάν (sultan) to refer to the Ottomans, and his tone never alternates.

The anonymous author is, in fact, explicitly disdainful of the Ottomans from the beginning of his chronicle until the very end. In at least one instance, he explicitly calls the Ottomans ἄνομος (lawless),¹¹⁴ and he frequently calls them ἄσεβής (impious)¹¹⁵ or ἀποστάτης (apostate).¹¹⁶ With regards to the conquest of Constantinople, he writes,

So we were delivered into the hands of lawless foes and most hateful apostates, into the hands of an unjust and most wicked emperor, throughout the entire earth, on account of our sins.¹¹⁷

Shortly above this passage the anonymous author elaborates on the sacrilege of Mehmed, the “rascal and murderer of Christians”¹¹⁸ who had “rushed, like a wild beast, towards the City with a countless multitude.”¹¹⁹

What a terrible fate it is, to fall into the hands of the living God! What can one say about the imperial tombs that were pried open? Bones were thrown around in jest; they hoped to find within the golden threads from vestments. They trampled over the remains of Emperor Constantine and those of other emperors and threw them into heaps of manure. Am I to sing again David’s lamentation for Jerusalem? They placed the mortal remains of Your slaves as if to display them in a vegetable shop; they offered the flesh of Your saints as prey to the birds of heaven; they poured the blood as if it were water, to the beasts of the earth....When, Lord, when will Your wrath come to an end?....You are just; we deserve everything that you have sent upon us.¹²⁰

Such “impiety” was not the work of a legitimate ruler who could be “tolerated” and accepted. For the anonymous author of the sixteenth century *Codex Oxoniensis-Lincolniensis*, the Ottomans were “illegal” “apostates” who lacked any legitimacy. They were a blight sent down by God to punish the Byzantines for their sins.

Conclusions

¹¹⁴ Philippides, *Emperors, Sultans, and Patriarchs of Constantinople*, 50-51.

¹¹⁵ Philippides, *Emperors, Sultans, and Patriarchs of Constantinople*, 24-25.

¹¹⁶ Philippides, *Emperors, Sultans, and Patriarchs of Constantinople*, 50-51.

¹¹⁷ Philippides, *Emperors, Sultans, and Patriarchs of Constantinople*, 51. This is one of the only passages in the whole text in which the anonymous author does use the term βασιλεύς to refer to an Ottoman sultan. It is exceptional.

¹¹⁸ Philippides, *Emperors, Sultans, and Patriarchs of Constantinople*, 55.

¹¹⁹ Philippides, *Emperors, Sultans, and Patriarchs of Constantinople*, 45.

¹²⁰ Philippides, *Emperors, Sultans, and Patriarchs of Constantinople*, 51.

While Doukas explicitly contrasted the “kingship” of the Palaiologoi with the “tyranny” of the Ottomans, Sphrantzes considered the Ottoman sultan to be “God’s executioner.” M.M.’s text is ambiguous, but he personally revolted against the Ottoman rule in collaboration with the Spanish. The anonymous author of the *Codex Oxoniensis-Lincolnensis* may or may not have taken up arms against the Ottomans, but he explicitly called them “lawless” rulers and did not censor his disdain for them.

Besides M.M., who believed that there is no relationship between orthodoxy, piety, and power, all of the other three authors discussed in this chapter agree that Constantinople fell and that God did not aid Emperor Constantine XI as punishment for Byzantine sins. All of these authors accept the Ottomans fatalistically, believing that they were sent by God as part of a divine plan. This did not translate, however, into belief in the “tolerated” legitimacy described by Hakan T. Karateke. There is, after all, a vast difference between a legitimate emperor and a “tyrant,” “executioner,” or “lawless” sovereign. In the next chapter I will examine authors who did accept the legitimacy of the Ottoman sultanate, even though they did not proffer theories of legitimacy.

Chapter III: “Habitual Legitimacy”

Of the nine authors under discussion in this thesis, only one, the anonymous author of the *Codex Barberinus Graecus 111* or *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans*, can be interpreted as accepting the legitimacy of the Ottoman sultanate out of “habit.” He differs from authors discussed in Chapter II in his clear belief in the legitimacy of the Ottoman Sultanate. He differs from authors discussed in Chapter IV, however, in that he offers no legitimizing discourse to bolster their rule intellectually. Whereas Karateke predicts a belief in legitimacy based on “toleration,” the term implies an inherent dislike for the Ottomans that this anonymous author does not evince. Thus I brand his conception of Ottoman legitimacy as “habitual” because it seems to be born not of “toleration” for something disliked, but rather out of acceptance for Ottoman institutions under which the author grew up and incorporated into his worldview without question.

The Codex Barberinus Graecus 111 or Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans

The *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans* was discovered by scholars very late, in 1907. Only one manuscript of it exists, and it lacks both beginning and end. Moreover, it is evident from internal references that the manuscript is not an original copy, but rather that it was based on a prototype. There are no explicit clues regarding the text’s date of composition or the identity of its author in the manuscript itself, and thus any

conclusions must be made on the basis of textual analysis. Lively debate has raged in the secondary literature with regards to both questions.¹²¹

G.T. Zoras, who first published the text in 1958, argued that it was written in 1532, but he was decisively refuted by Elizabeth Zacharaidou in the 1960s. She demonstrated that the author relied on Italian sources of the late sixteenth century, and she posited that the text must have been written sometime between 1573 and 1625. Later, Monsignor P. Canard put all debate to rest with the discovery of additional fragments of the chronicle describing the reign of Ottoman Sultan Mehmed III (1595-1603). Thus the chronicle was undoubtedly written in the seventeenth century, but it could not possibly have been written later than 1671, the year of the death of the manuscript's first owner, Cardinal Antonio Barberini.¹²²

The *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans* is a collection of chronologically arranged biographies. The body of the extant text begins with Sultan Murad I and ends with Bayezid II, though, as mentioned, additional fragments from the biographies of later sultans have been found. By far the most space is devoted to Mehmed II's biography, which comprises about a third of the extant text. With regards to topic, the *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans* lies within the tradition of Greek history-writing focused solely on the exploits of the Ottomans, like the history of Chalkokondyles, as opposed to chronicles focusing on the late Palaiologoi or on ecclesiastical affairs. With regards to language, however, the chronicle stands outside of any tradition. Almost all Greek historians of the Early Modern Period wrote either in an archaic Atticized language, like Kritovoulos, or in a mixed language incorporating both ancient and vernacular elements, as did authors associated with Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul like Manuel Malaxos.¹²³ The anonymous author of *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans* did not follow either linguistic tradition and wrote solely in the vernacular.

Given that explicit data is almost non-existent regarding the identity of the author of the *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans*, the author's Greek language has been used as the primary piece of evidence. In 1960 Elizabeth Zachariadou published a manuscript on the chronicle in which she argues that, given the chronicle's "linguistic unity," conclusions about the author's identity based on language are reliable even if the

¹²¹ Marios Philippides, "Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans," *Historians of the Ottoman Empire*, Ed. C. Kafadar, H. Karateke, C. Fleischer, www.ottomanhistorians.com, 2008.

¹²² Philippides, "Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans."

¹²³ Philippides, "Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans."

copyist changed some of the chronicle's content.¹²⁴ She proceeds to note how the author wrote in a vernacular Greek and that he makes many mistakes, especially when he attempts to borrow from the ecclesiastical language of his time. Moreover, he uses many Italian words and Italian forms of proper nouns for both people and places, and he was very well-informed about "Turkish themes" and Turkish terminology. She also notes the "laic character of the chronicle,"¹²⁵ by which she means that the author's worldview does not seem to be very religious and that his few religious references seem to be very formulaic and superficial. On the bases of these points she argues that the author must have been an uneducated man who lacked a Classical or ecclesiastical education and who lived parts of his life under both Ottoman and Italian rule. She also shows later that he knew Italian.¹²⁶ In sum, this chronicle offers us a Greek "popular view,"¹²⁷ or rather, the perspective of the common man.

Just as the chronicle's "linguistic unity" allowed Zachariadou to derive conclusions about the chronicler's identity based on language, likewise the text's consistent attitude towards the Ottomans allows for conclusions about its author's views on the legitimacy of Ottoman rule. With regards to this question, the strongest evidence derives from the structure of the chronicle, the author's choice of terminology, his assessments of the character of Ottoman sultans at the end of each biography, and his comments about the late-Byzantine nobility.

To write a book of biographies of sultans, after all, gently implies in and of itself a belief in the legitimacy of their rule, granted that there be no explicit condemnation made elsewhere. The author's choice of terminology lacks any such condemnation. While the author usually uses the Arabic word σουλτάν (sultan) for the Ottoman rulers, he sometimes also uses the legitimizing Greek term βασιλεύς (emperor),¹²⁸ the same word that he uses for the Byzantine emperors. The author does identify with the Byzantines as opposed to the Ottomans, but at the same time there is no trace of a general anti-Ottoman bias. Moreover, he describes Ottoman succession to the throne as

¹²⁴ Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, *Το Χρονικό των Τούρκων Σουλτάνων και το Ιταλικό του Πρότυπο*, (Thessaloniki: Society of Macedonian Studies, 1960): 17.

¹²⁵ Zachariadou, 19.

¹²⁶ Zachariadou, 18-21.

¹²⁷ Philippides, "Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans."

¹²⁸ E.g. G.T. Zoras, *Χρονικόν Περί Των Τούρκων Σουλτάνων*, (Athens: The Department of Byzantine and Neo-Hellenic Philology of the University of Athens, 1958), 28. "Τέλος τοῦ βασιλέως σουλτάν Μουράτη, βασιλέας τῶν Τουρκῶν."

“assumption of hereditary rule,” or βασιλεία.¹²⁹ Doukas, as we have shown, used this same term to legitimize the Palaiologoi at the expense of the Ottomans through a Thukydidean contrast between rulers who owe their power to prerogative and tyrants who owe it to usurpation. Here, however, the anonymous author uses it for the Ottomans and implies that they rule within the confines of law and custom.

Not only did the anonymous author lack a general anti-Ottoman bias, he considers some of the Ottoman sultans to have been men of good character who are worthy of commendation. This is evident from the ends of his biographies, where he offers honest character assessments of sultans in which he both criticizes and commends them.

The anonymous chronicler held entirely positive views about some sultans, including Mehmed I and Bayezid II. He states that Mehmed I had been the first Ottoman to be granted the title “sultan,” because “they loved him very much and [because] he was a good emperor.”¹³⁰ Of Bayezid II he writes,

Sultan Bayezid loved amity more than war. He was a modest man. He loved philosophy, and he loved reading the deeds of past emperors. He was, by nature, a good man.¹³¹

Towards sultans who succeeded in war, the chronicler’s pro-Byzantine loyalties seem to have made him more negative. For example, of Sultan Murad I he writes,

They say, since he was [a bit] frenzied, he killed with his [own] hand many *pashas* and *beys* who were at fault. But [he was] modest to those who made obeisance to him. He loved to hunt, and he loved his *reaya*. He was strong of body [and] kept his word.¹³²

Here he lists admirable qualities, such as Sultan Murad’s honesty, along with negative ones. In general, the chronicler’s assessments seem unbiased for or against the Ottomans in general, but he clearly preferred some sultans over others.

One sultan about whom the anonymous author held exceptionally negative feelings was Sultan Mehmed II. On multiple occasions, he describes Mehmed II as

¹²⁹ E.g. Zoras, 123. “Ἐσονται νὰ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ σουλτάν Μεχεμέτης, ἐκάθησε τὴν βασιλείαν ὁ σουλτάν Μπαγιαζίτης.”

¹³⁰ Zoras, 55. “Καὶ τοῦτο διατὶ τὸν ἀγαπούσανε πολλὰ καὶ ἦτονε καλὸς βασιλέας.”

¹³¹ Zoras, 140. “Λοιπὸν ὁ σουλτάν Μπαγιαζίτης πλέο ἀγάπα τὴν ἀγάπην παρὰ τὴν μάχην. Καὶ ἦτονε ἄνθρωπος ταπεινός. Ἀγάπα τὴν φιλοσοφίαν καὶ ἀγάπα νὰ διαβάξῃ τις πρᾶξεις τῶν ἀπερασμένων βασιλέων. Καὶ ἦτονε φύσις ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος.”

¹³² Zoras, 28. “Λέγουσι, ἐπειδὴ ἦτονε μανιώδης, ἐσκότωσε μὲ τὸ χέρι του πολλοὺς πασάδες καὶ μπέηδες, ὅποιος τοῦ ἔφταιγε ἄμμη ταπεινὸς εἰς ἐκεינוῦς, ὅπου τὸν ἐπροσκυνοῦσαν. Ἀγάπα τὰ κυνήγια ἀγάπα καὶ τοὺς ραγιαδες. Ἦτονε δυνατὸς ‘ς τὸ κορμὶ. Ἐστεκέτονε ‘ς τὸν λόγον του.”

being untrue to his word. He also describes him as being violent and brutal, and he even accuses Mehmed II of trying to commit homosexual rape on Vlad, the prince of Moldavia.¹³³ As with the other sultans, he offers a general assessment of Mehmed which includes some good qualities, such as his bravery, along with his alleged faults:

He was brave and obstinate in war, cunning, and he did not have anything else on his mind [other than] how to cheat the nobles [and] to take their rule, as much the Turks as the Christians. He was an astrologer. He knew five languages well: Turkish, Romaic, Frankish, Arabic, Chaldean, and Persian. He loved to read [about] the deeds and battles of Emperor Alexander, and likewise also [about] the battles that Julius Caesar, emperor of Rome, waged. He loved fornication exceedingly, and he was very frenzied and cruel and an enemy of the Christians.¹³⁴

In sum, the Ottomans in general are neither saints nor villains in the *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans*, though individual sultans could be one or the other. At no point does the chronicler imply that he questions the basic legitimacy of Ottoman rule. Like Michael Psellos had done centuries earlier in his *Chronographia*, he could criticize or praise individual rulers without questioning the ruling structure.

There is one group, however, that is consistently depicted as villains in the *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans*: the late-Byzantine nobility. The anonymous author repeatedly claims that the late Byzantine Empire was too poor to properly defend itself during its final years and that its nobility hid and withheld their wealth rather than contributing to the common cause.¹³⁵ For example, he writes the following concerning the reign of John Palaiologus:

¹³³ Zoras, 109.

¹³⁴ Zoras, 121. “Λοιπὸν αὐτὸς ἦτονε ἀνδρεῖος καὶ πεισματάρης εἰς τοὺς πολέμους καὶ πονηρὸς καὶ δὲν ἔβαλε ἄλλο εἰς τὸ νοῦ τοῦ, μόνε πῶς νὰ γελᾷ τοὺς ἀφεντάδες νὰ παίρνη τὴν ἀφεντία τους, τόσο τοὺς Τούρκους ὡσὰν καὶ τοὺς χριστιανούς. Ἦτονε καὶ ἀστρολόγος. Ἦξερε πέντε γλῶσσες καλὰ: τούρκικα, ρωμεῖκα, φράγκικα, ἀράπικα, χαλδεῖκα, πέρσικα. Καὶ ἀγάπα νὰ διαβάζη τις πρᾶξεις καὶ πολέμους τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ βασιλέως, ὁμοίως καὶ τοὺς πολέμους ὅπου ἔκαμε ὁ Γιούλιος Καίσαρας, τῆς Ρώμας ὁ βασιλεὺς. Καὶ ἀγάπα τὴν πορνεία περισσὰ καὶ ἦτονε μανιώδης πολλὰ καὶ σκληρὸς καὶ ἐχθρὸς τῶν χριστιανῶν.

¹³⁵ See also, Leonard of Chios in *The Siege of Constantinople 1453: Seven Contemporary Accounts*, Trans. J.R. Melville Jones, (Amsterdam: Adolf. M. Hakkert, 1972), 26, 38.

Alas, the great poverty which was afflicting the empire! While the nobles were rich, the empire was bankrupt. And they did not lend money for [the empire's] necessities.¹³⁶

Later he explicitly blames the decline of the Byzantine Empire on internal dissensions among Emperor Manuel Palaiologos' heirs,¹³⁷ and he states that "the late emperors were the cause [of the loss of] the greatest empire"¹³⁸ through their ineptitude.

Throughout his account of the siege of Constantinople, in particular, he repeatedly accuses the Byzantine nobility of hiding their wealth rather than using it to help the empire. For example, he writes,

O money-loving, seditious, treacherous Romans! You handed your country over. While your empire was poor and exhorted you with tears in its eyes to lend money to give and gather fighting men to render aid and fight, you refused with oaths [about] how you don't have [any money] and how you are poor! But later, when the Turk conquered you, you were found [out to be] rich, and the Turk took you and chopped off your heads, as the subsequent [part of this] history will show.¹³⁹

In the end, the chronicler laments how the Turks were able to capture all of this treasure that should have been spent in defense of Constantinople.¹⁴⁰

Whereas most other Early Modern Greek chroniclers were in some way associated with the Greek-speaking elite, religious or lay, the anonymous author of the *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans* was certainly not. Through his assessment of the late Byzantine elite, we gain access to an opinion that was probably widely held among common Greek-speaking Ottoman subjects about the cause of the Byzantine Empire's decline. At various points in the *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans*, the chronicler makes clichéd stray references to how "sin" prevented God from aiding the Byzantines.¹⁴¹

¹³⁶ Zoras, 26-27. "Ἀλίμονον! Μεγάλην πτωχείαν, ὅπου ἦτον 'ς τὸ δυστυχισμένο βασίλειο, ὅπου οἱ ἄρχοντες ἦτανε πλούσοι καὶ ἡ βασιλεία ἦτονε πτωχή. Καὶ δὲν ἐδανείζανε εἰς τὶς χρεῖες."

¹³⁷ Zoras, 53.

¹³⁸ Zoras, 57. "αὐτοὶ οἱ ὕστεροι βασιλεῖς ἦτανε ἡ ἀφορμὴ καὶ ἐχάθη τὸ μεγαλῶτατο βασίλειο."

¹³⁹ Zoras, 83. "ὦ Ρωμαῖοι φιλόργυροι, δημηγέρτες, τραδιτόροι, ὅπου ἐτραδίρετε τὴν πατρίδα σας, ὅπου ὁ βασιλέας σας ἦτονε πτωχὸς καὶ σᾶς ἐπαρακάλειε μὲ τὰ δάκρυα 'ς τὰ μάτια νὰ τοῦ δανείσετε φλωρία διὰ νὰ δώση νὰ μαζώξη πολεμιστάδες ἀνθρώπους νὰ βοηθήσωνε καὶ νὰ πολεμήσουνε, καὶ ἐσεῖς ἀρνιέστε μεθ' ὅρκου πῶς δὲν ἔχετε καὶ εἶστε πτωχοί! Ἀμμή ὑστέρου, ὅπου σᾶς ἐπῆρε ὁ Τοῦρκος, εὐρέθητε πλούσοι καὶ σᾶς τὸ πῆρε ὁ Τοῦρκος καὶ ἔκοψε καὶ τὸ κεφάλι σας, ὡς θέλει τὸ φανερῶσει ἡ ἱστορία ὁμπρός."

¹⁴⁰ Zoras, 92.

¹⁴¹ E.g. Zoras, 80. "Ἀμμή ἡ ἀμαρτία τοῦ λαοῦ δὲν ἄφινε."

Sometimes he also refers to how “fortune” aided one side or another.¹⁴² But as Zachariadou showed, overall his worldview is not superstitious, and he does not articulate any coherent intellectual context through which these stray comments might become intelligible. Rather, he seems to use them as literary tropes borrowed from other histories.

In sum, the author conveys much greater contempt for the Byzantine elite than he does for the Ottomans. At no point does he imply that the Ottomans rule with any less legitimacy than the Byzantines had, though he himself clearly identifies with the later. At the same time, he does not offer any argument to bolster the legitimacy of the Ottomans, and he clearly loathes some sultans, like Mehmed II. It is noteworthy that he lived in the seventeenth century. For the anonymous chronicler, Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory was a fact of life from birth until death. It seems that he had incorporated assumptions about strong Ottoman rule into his worldview and accepted the Ottomans out of “habit,” we can say, without seriously considering why they were legitimate. The lack of overt religiosity in his world-view seems to have made this possible for him in a way that it did not with other late authors, like Melissourgos-Melissenos.

Conclusions

Thus the *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans* gives us a glimpse into the mindset of a “common” Greek-speaking Ottoman subject. He was not very religious, takes no interest in church politics, and acknowledges the authority in power without seeming to give the question of legitimacy too much thought. He maintains, however a “Greek” identity and pro-Byzantine sympathies

Analysis of authors discussed in Chapters II and III provides opportunity to modify Hakan T. Karateke’s paradigm, discussed in the introduction of this thesis. Whereas Karateke described a “tolerated legitimacy” born of fatalism, none of these authors evince the attitude that he predicted. That is to say, authors who viewed the

¹⁴² E.g. Zoras, 144. “Ἀμμή ἢ τύχης ἐβοήθα τοῦ Σελίμη εἰσὲ πᾶσα του βουλή.”

Ottomans as being undesirable overlords sent as a punishment from God, like the Babylonians of the Hebrew Testament, tended not to accept a “tolerated legitimacy,” but rather to deny the Ottoman state’s legitimacy altogether, as we saw in Chapter II. A priest who tolerates a pox sent by God need not necessarily consider their rule to be “legitimate.” The “habitual legitimacy” that we saw in this chapter stems more from the author’s acceptance of the world around him as it is than from “toleration” of a necessary evil. The author of the *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans* held the Ottomans in no more negative regard than he did the Byzantines, and he did not seem to think about the full ramifications of the transition too much.

Nonetheless, the *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans* does not offer a coherent theory of justification for Ottoman rule. The next chapter of this thesis will address authors who took this intellectual leap and articulated theories of Ottoman legitimacy. I will argue that the Classical and ancient Near Eastern literary tradition provided these authors with modes of thought that allowed them to escape the monotheistic divide between “believer” and “unbeliever,” and I will demonstrate that there were Greek-speaking Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire who developed “normative” theories to legitimize Ottoman rule.

Chapter IV: “Normative” Theories of Legitimacy for Ottoman Rule

Of the nine authors discussed in this thesis, four offer legitimizing discourses for the Ottoman sultanate aimed at Greek-speaking Christian subjects. Two of these authors, Kritovoulos and Chalkokondyles, were fifteenth century Byzantine elites who wrote in a high Classical Greek and borrowed from Ancient Greek literature to craft theories of legitimacy for the Ottomans based on their superior “merit.” The other two chroniclers, the author of the late sixteenth century *Patriarchal History of Constantinople* (PHC) and the priest Papasynadinos, author of the early seventeenth century *Chronicle of Serres*, were churchmen who depicted Ottoman sultans as unbiased arbiters and sometimes patrons of Christians whose legitimacy stemmed from their “justice.” Thus two lines of arguments developed in different social and temporal contexts and were aimed at distinct audiences.

Kritovoulos of Imbros and the Proemium of his History

Kritovoulos of Imbros was a Greek scholar in the service of Mehmed II. Mehmed II appointed him governor of Imbros in 1456, and Kritovoulos dedicated his Greek-language biography to him.¹⁴³ Kritovoulos completed the text in 1467, in the midst of Mehmed’s reign. His biography stands within the Ancient Greek historical tradition

¹⁴³ Babinger, Franz, *Mehmed the Conqueror and His Times*, ed. William C. Hickman, (Princeton, 1978), 136.

and was written primarily for educated Greek-speaking former Byzantine subjects and for the sultan's court. Its justification for the imperial power of Mehmed II borrows directly from Ancient Greek historians.

Kritovoulos begins his biography of Mehmed II by explaining his “reasons for writing.”¹⁴⁴ His introductory section borrows extensively from the *proemium* of Herodotus' *History* in its form, vocabulary, and ideas. In the fifth century BCE, “Herodotus of Halicarnassus presented his inquiry so that the *great and marvelous* deeds of men, achieved by both the *Greeks and the barbarians*, would not be lost to time” (I.1).¹⁴⁵ In his *History*, “Kritovoulos the islander, an author from among the first [men] of Imbros, wrote his work because he deemed that works so *great and marvelous* done by us [moderns] should not remain unheard” (I.1).¹⁴⁶ He adds that the “*great and marvelous deeds* done now in these times,” particularly the fall of the “Romans,” were no less worthy of note than those of the ancient “*Greeks and barbarians*” (I.3).¹⁴⁷ Later in the work, Kritovoulos also extensively mimics Thucydides and Arian and presents Mehmed II as if he was a great Classical statesman or general, like Pericles, Brasidas, or Alexander.¹⁴⁸ He even depicts him as a Classical philosopher.¹⁴⁹ Such presentations prompted cognitive dissonance within Kritovoulos himself, however, as he did not actually regard Mehmed II as a Greek with connection to the Classical past. Thus, in the next section of his work Kritovoulos admits and grapples with the novelty and contradiction of writing Greek literature in praise of the Muslim conqueror of Constantinople.

¹⁴⁴ “τὰς αἰτίας τῆς συγγραφῆς.” Kritovoulos, *Critobuli Imbriotae Historiae*, ed. Diether Roderich Reinsch, (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1983), 12.

¹⁴⁵ Herodotus, *The Histories* (Greek text), The Perseus Digital Library, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>. “Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησέος ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις ἦδε, ὡς μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γένηται, μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θαυμαστά, τὰ μὲν Ἕλλησι τὰ δὲ βαρβάροις ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλεᾶ γένηται, τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ δι’ ἣν αἰτίην ἐπολέμησαν ἀλλήλοισι.”

¹⁴⁶ Kritovoulos, 12. “Κριτόβουλος ὁ νησιώτης, τὰ πρῶτα τῶν Ἰμβριωτῶν, τὴν συγγραφὴν τήνδε ξυνέγραψε δικαιώσας μὴ πράγματα οὕτω μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστά ἐφ’ ἡμῶν γεγονότα μείναι ἀνήκουστα...” Emphasis added.

¹⁴⁷ Kritovoulos, 12. “ἔργα τε γὰρ δὴ μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστά ἐν τοῖς νῦν καιροῖς,” “Ῥωμαῖος,” “Ἕλλησι καὶ βαρβάροις.”

¹⁴⁸ Reinsch, Diether Roderich, “Kritobulos of Imbros—Learned Historian, Ottoman *Raya* and Byzantine Patriot,” *Recueil des Travaux de l’Institut d’Etudes Byzantines*, XL (2003), 303-304.

¹⁴⁹ Kritovoulos, 166. “ἔστι γὰρ τῶν ἄκρως φιλοσόφων ὁ βασιλεύς.”

After describing his “reasons for writing,” Kritovoulos offers an “entreaty”¹⁵⁰ which contains his attempt to justify the imperial power of the Ottoman sultanate. There he defends himself against anticipated criticisms of his documentation of the fall of the Byzantine Empire and his own “people” (III.1).¹⁵¹ He provides the following defense:

For who has not known that from the time of man’s genesis the attributes of kingship or lordship has not remained upon the same [people] and not been confined to one people or race. Just like the planets it has wandered and settled everywhere, both shifting always from race to race and from place to place, at some times to the Assyrians, Medes, and Persians, at others to the Greeks and Romans. It settles itself in accordance with the time and period and has never come to the same place (III, 4). And so it is not something marvelous that the same things as these are done and experienced now and the Romans lose their fortune and rule...(III, 5).¹⁵²

Kritovoulos then goes on to explain how the Jewish historian Josephus criticized his own people’s folly and praised the valor of the Romans when they took Jerusalem and repressed the Jewish revolt of the first century CE. Kritovoulos claims that just as the Romans’ valor and skill justified them and earned them fortune’s favor, the Ottomans also earned victory through merit. It is therefore not treason to praise the great deeds of the Ottomans and to criticize Byzantine folly, as virtue is always worthy of praise. As Kritovoulos writes, the Greeks should not “wish to rob them [the Ottomans] of the praises and prizes of virtue...it is unjust” (III, 8).¹⁵³

Kritovoulos quotes Josephus to bolster his claim that the Ottomans earned the right to rule through their merit, adding a link to a literary chain that stretches even farther back to Polybius. Polybius had been the client of Publius Scipio in the second century BCE, and he had been sent to Rome after the capture of his native Arcadia. He

¹⁵⁰ “παραίτησις.” Kritovoulos, *Critobuli Imbriotae Historiae*, ed. Diether Roderich Reinsch, (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1983), 13.

¹⁵¹ Kritovoulos, 14. “γένος.”

¹⁵² Kritovoulos, 14. “τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδεν, ὥς, ἐξότου γεγόνασιν ἄνθρωποι, τὰ τῆς βασιλείας καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς οὐδ’ ὁλως ἔμεινεν ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν οὐδ’ ἐνὶ γένει τε καὶ ἔθνει περιεκλείσθη, ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ πλανώμενά τε ἀεὶ καὶ ἐξ ἔθνων ἔθνη καὶ τόπους ἐκ τόπων ἀμείβοντα πανταχοῦ μεταβέβηκέ τε καὶ περιέστη, νῦν μὲν ἐς Ἀσσυρίους καὶ Μήδους καὶ Πέρσας, νῦν δὲ ἐς Ἕλληνας καὶ Ῥωμαίους κατὰ καιρούς τε καὶ περιόδους ἐνιαυτῶν ἐπιχωρίασαντά τε καὶ οὐδέποτε ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν βεβηκότα; οὐδὲν τοίνυν θαυμαστὸν καὶ νῦν τὰ ἑαυτῶν δρᾶσαι τε καὶ παθεῖν καὶ Ῥωμαίους μὲν τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὴν τύχην ἀπολιπεῖν...”

¹⁵³ Kritovoulos, 15. “ἀποστερεῖν ἐθέλειν τούτους τῶν ἐπαίνων καὶ τῶν ἄθλων τῆς ἀρετῆς...οὐ δίκαιον.”

eventually wrote a long history in praise of Roman institutions and merit. The philosophical basis of his history is an internally inconsistent concept of “fortune,” τύχη in Greek, which is usually fickle but sometimes also rewards the just, particularly in cases in which Polybius discusses his patrons. In him we find the first in a series of Greek literary toadies, followed later by Josephus and Kritovoulos, who use this concept of fortune to explain to their communities that their sons have been killed, their sisters have been enslaved, and their cities have been ravaged because fortune blesses their valorous opponents, while it punishes their own corruption. A version of this argument that the imperial office can be a “reward for virtue” also existed in Late Antique and Byzantine panegyric literature,¹⁵⁴ though Kritovoulos shows that he borrows it from earlier antecedents through his reference to Josephus.

Thus Kritovoulos consciously places his work within the Ancient Greek historical tradition, and he borrows from this tradition to justify the sovereignty of the Ottoman sultanate: just as fortune shined upon the Romans because of their merit and valor, it also rewards the Ottomans with hegemony. To demonstrate this, he consistently refers to Mehmet with the Greek appellation βασιλεύς, or “emperor,” the term applied by Greek authors for the rulers of the Roman and Byzantine Empires. Reference to God is almost entirely absent, except for a short and perfunctory thanksgiving at the end of the letter (Epistle 16).¹⁵⁵ His embrace of Classical form and of the term “Hellene” in lieu of more religious Byzantine literary styles and vocabulary was common among intellectuals of Late Byzantium, as nostalgia and reverence for ancient times seems to have accompanied contemporary collapse.¹⁵⁶ In sum, to Kritovoulos Ottoman rule was as legitimate as that of the Romans had been, and its legitimacy lay on the same bases.

¹⁵⁴ See Dimiter Angelov, *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204-1330*, (Cambridge University Press, 2007), 126.

¹⁵⁵ Kritovoulos, 8.

¹⁵⁶ Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence*, (Cambridge, 1968), 119-120.

Laonikos Chalkokondyles and his Demonstrations of Histories, Books I-III¹⁵⁷

Less is known about the biography of Chalkokondyles than about Kritovoulos. He descended from an esteemed Athenian family and was probably born in Athens in 1423 or 1430. His father, however, was an opponent of the Acciajuoli family which ruled a Florentine duchy in Athens from 1388 until 1456,¹⁵⁸ and he fled with his family to the Peloponnesus in 1435. It is known that in 1447 Chalkokondyles was a student of the great Byzantine intellectual Plethon in Mistra, and internal evidence in Chalkokondyles' history implies that he died, at unknown whereabouts, sometime around 1490.¹⁵⁹

The importance of Chalkokondyles' association with Plethon cannot be overemphasized. Plethon was a late Byzantine Neoplatonic philosopher who was exiled from Byzantium to Mistra by Emperor Manuel II in 1410. He was suspected of heresy and polytheism throughout most of his career, and his final work was, in fact, a *Book of Laws* which sought to reconcile Platonism and Ancient Greek polytheism.¹⁶⁰ It was probably from Plethon that Chalkokondyles developed his mastery over the Greek classics, and he was undoubtedly influenced by Plethon's divergent views on religion and by his conception of historical causality and fate.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁷ All quotes from Chalkokondyles are taken from *Laonikos Chalkokondyles: A Translation and Commentary of the "Demonstrations of Histories," (Books I-III)*, Trans. Nicolaos Nicoloudis, (Athens: St. D. Basilopoulos, 1996).

¹⁵⁸ Alice-Mary Talbot, "Acciajuoli," *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Vol. I, (Oxford University Press, 1991), 10.

¹⁵⁹ Alice-Mary Talbot, "Laonikos Chalkokondyles," *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Vol. I, (Oxford University Press, 1991), 407.

¹⁶⁰ Alice-Mary Talbot, "George Gemistos Plethon," *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Vol. III, (Oxford University Press, 1991), 1685.

¹⁶¹ See, Jonathan Harris, "The Influence of Plethon's Idea of Fate on the Historian Laonikos Chalkokondyles," *Proceedings of the International Congress on Plethon and his Time, Mystras, 26-29 June 2002*, Ed. L.G. Benakis and Ch. P. Baloglou, (Athens: Society for Peloponnesian and Byzantine Studies, 2004): 211-227.

Like Kritovoulos, Chalkokondyles models his history on Herodotus, to the extent that the title of his work, the “Demonstrations of Histories,” is a quote from the first line of the *Persian Wars*. He borrows wording, tropes, and references from Herodotus throughout his work and clearly aims to place it within the Classical Greek historical tradition. The work is not Christian in character, attributing historical causality to “fortune” or τύχη rather than to the Orthodox Christian God. Chalkokondyles’ concept of “fortune” is, however, more complex than Kritovoulos’. He writes, for example, that “the Romans became the most powerful nation in the world, as a result of good fortune (τύχη) and political virtue (ἀρετή) being in balance.”¹⁶² Thus he is more explicit in the way that he explains the interconnection between these two forces than Kritovoulos had been, and he seems to have considered the question of historical causality in greater depth.

Another major difference between Kritovoulos and Chalkokondyles is the scope of their works. While Kritovoulos limits himself largely to the reign Mehmed II, Chalkokondyles’ project is far vaster. He aimed to explain “how the power of the Hellenes in a short time disappeared, destroyed by the Turks, and how the affairs of the Turks prospered and their power increased to its present preeminence.”¹⁶³ Thus his history, which he wrote after Kritovoulos sometime in the 1480s, addresses events that occurred in a much broader period, 1298-1463.¹⁶⁴ He was influenced by Ottoman Turkish conceptions of their own past and may have even used Turkish sources. For example, just like the Ottoman chroniclers of his day, Chalkokondyles links the Ottoman dynasty to Oğuz and his descendants.¹⁶⁵

Chalkokondyles shows in many ways that he deemed the Ottomans to rule with as much legitimacy as the Romans had in their prime. Like Kritovoulos, he sees history in terms of a succession of worldly empires. He writes,

While [the Greeks] were prospering in many places around the world, we are told that the Assyrians came to power in Asia, the memory of whose exploits goes back a very long way. Then the Medes took control, under the leadership of Arbakes who expelled Sardanapalus, the King of the Assyrians. In turn they lost power to the Persians, who were led by Cyrus, the son of Cambyses. Thenceforth the power of the Persians greatly increased, and they even crossed over to Europe. Not many generations after that Alexander, the son of Philip and King of the

¹⁶² Chalkokondyles, 91.

¹⁶³ Chalkokondyles, 95.

¹⁶⁴ Alice-Mary Talbot, “Laonikos Chalkokondyles,” 407.

¹⁶⁵ Chalkokondyles, 99.

Macedonians, expelled the Persians and conquered India and a great part of Libya and Europe as well. He then left his kingdom to his successors. At that point the Romans became the most powerful nation in the world.¹⁶⁶

Later he shows that he differentiates between the Roman and Byzantine Empires,¹⁶⁷ and he focuses his work on the decline of the later, which had lost almost all of its territory to the Ottomans by his lifetime.¹⁶⁸ Chalkokondyles uses the honorable term βασιλεύς to describe both the Ottoman sultans and the Byzantine emperors, often in direct juxtaposition, thus placing them on an equal footing.¹⁶⁹

In the course of his history, Chalkokondyles evinces great admiration for the Ottomans and palpable disdain for Late Byzantine rulers. For example, he often uses Herodotian language to describe the “glorious and heroic deeds” (“ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ περιφανῆ”) of Ottomans,¹⁷⁰ and he considered Osman to be “this nation’s first chieftain,” one who “governed this nation as well as he could.”¹⁷¹ His comments on Orhan are brief, but he describes his son Süleyman as having been “a very good general and a most capable leader in war and in raids”¹⁷² who won a “glorious and famous” victory.¹⁷³ Of Murad, he writes that he performed “great deeds”¹⁷⁴ and “showed a tolerance similar to that of Cyrus, the son of Cambyses,” behaving “very moderately and liberally towards the rulers of the Triballi, the Mysians and particularly the Hellenes, who were his subjects.”¹⁷⁵ Later he sums up Murad’s reign by writing,

[Murad] fought great wars both in Asia and in Europe for thirty one years and enjoyed such a good fortune and was so valiant that he was never defeated in a battle. He thus assumed considerable powers and territories in both continents. Even when he had reached a very old age he did not stop fighting his enemies, but he always seemed to be in a fury in battle, everywhere lusting for blood. Time not spent fighting his enemies he spent hunting or planning them. He never rested; when he was not waging war he hunted. In fact it was thought that he was much better at this than previous kings, demonstrating haste and speed in his old age as in his youth. This distinguished him above many famous princes and kings; he was tireless and outstanding in all things. He got involved in everything and did not leave anything unfinished. We are informed that he committed greater crimes than previous kings but that he spoke very kindly to his subjects and to the sons of

¹⁶⁶ Chalkokondyles, 91.

¹⁶⁷ Chalkokondyles, 93-95.

¹⁶⁸ Chalkokondyles, 95.

¹⁶⁹ E.g., Chalkokondyles, 135, 137.

¹⁷⁰ Chalkokondyles, 103.

¹⁷¹ Chalkokondyles, 103.

¹⁷² Chalkokondyles, 125.

¹⁷³ Chalkokondyles, 123.

¹⁷⁴ Chalkokondyles, 131, 133.

¹⁷⁵ Chalkokondyles, 133.

princes and treated them very moderately. He respected all his men and was always ready to speak to them. He was very effective in rousing them into battle and, they say, became very good at taking command when he went into a battle. He was also charming and an able debater. He punished very severely anyone who did wrong but was very moderate in conversation. Of all the kings in his family it is said that he valued his word most...¹⁷⁶

In sum, Chalkokondyles deemed Murat to have been a model ruler by many standards of the time.

In contrast to the “political virtue” of the Ottomans, Chalkokondyles describes rampant Byzantine corruption and incompetence. In the midst of enumerating Ottoman successes, Chalkokondyles states that the Byzantine Emperor Andronikos II (1282-1328) was “[leading] a dissolute and licentious life” and overseeing policies that would “[lead] to a complete ruin...caused by the corruption of the imperial government.”¹⁷⁷ In particular, he accuses Andronikos of “serving the cause of...[the] aristocracy and in this way [exhausting] the revenues of the empire.”¹⁷⁸ He describes dissent against the “arrogance” of John VI Cantacuzene (1347-1354)¹⁷⁹ and intense rivalry within the Palaiologos dynasty.¹⁸⁰ Of Manuel II (1391-1425), he writes,

It is said that he lusted after women and indulged in debauchery. He liked women who played the harp and spent time with them. He busied himself with such things while paying little heed to the duties of monarchy.¹⁸¹

Overall, Chalkokondyles’ character assessments of the Palaiologan emperors are usually not substantiated by other histories.¹⁸² His criticisms seem to be born as much out of bias as out of genuine critique of Byzantine policy.

Throughout his first three books, in fact, Chalkokondyles evinces clear pro-Ottoman bias. He even describes Bayezid I with some sympathy, describing “great deeds” performed both by him¹⁸³ and by Evrenos Bey¹⁸⁴ before Bayezid fell into a cycle of arrogance,¹⁸⁵ folly,¹⁸⁶ and retribution¹⁸⁷ reminiscent of Ancient Greek tragedy. He

¹⁷⁶ Chalkokondyles, 153-155.

¹⁷⁷ Chalkokondyles, 119.

¹⁷⁸ Chalkokondyles, 109.

¹⁷⁹ Chalkokondyles, 131.

¹⁸⁰ See, for example, Chalkokondyles, 147-149.

¹⁸¹ Chalkokondyles, 207.

¹⁸² See, for example, Note 69 in Nicolaos Nicoloudis, *Laonikos Chalkokondyles: A Translation and Commentary of the “Demonstrations of Histories” (Books I-III)*, 166.

¹⁸³ Chalkokondyles, 189.

¹⁸⁴ Chalkokondyles, 231.

¹⁸⁵ Chalkokondyles, 241.

¹⁸⁶ Chalkokondyles, 239.

¹⁸⁷ Chalkokondyles, 243.

writes, “When Bayazid had acquired enormous power he was chastened by God, lest he be arrogant.”¹⁸⁸ Despite his patent pro-Ottomanism, Chalkokondyles retained a firm Hellenic identity. He loved the Greek language and the Hellenic cultural tradition, and he ultimately admired the Ottomans because he saw them as resembling more the heroes of the Hellenic past than the Byzantines themselves did. Chalkokondyles believed that in his lifetime, it was the Turks’ turn to rule as a reward for their virtue and merit. The Hellenes, however, would have their day again. When defending his use of Greek to write Ottoman history, he states:

Let it not be held against us that we have narrated these events in the Hellenic tongue, for the language of the Hellenes has spread to many places around the world and has mingled with many others. Its present glory is great and it will be even greater in the future, when a Greek emperor will again rule over a not inconsiderable dominion and his imperial descendants will gather together the offspring of the Hellenes and govern them according to their own customs, in a manner pleasing to them and authoritative to others.¹⁸⁹

Like Doukas, Chalkokondyles awaited a Hellenic emperor. But he was far more patient and willing to grant the Turks *their* moment of glory and legitimate rule.

Kritovoulos and Chalkokondyles: A Common Response to a Post-Byzantine Reality

Both Kritovoulos and Chalkokondyles present legitimizing discourses for the Ottomans which have the same crux. To them, legitimate kingship moved from empire to empire, people to people, and never rested in the same hands. They made no differentiation between polytheist, Zoroastrian, or Christian empires considering all to rule with equal legitimacy at their own preordained moments. Both authors were well-educated elites who lived at the end of the fifteenth century. They had the intellectual ammunition to react to changing conditions thanks to their Classical educations, and the non-Christian nature of their educations allowed them to bypass the Christian-infidel dichotomy. Their arguments, however, were clearly aimed at other educated elite Byzantines, like themselves, and would find less appeal among the pious Orthodox

¹⁸⁸ Chalkokondyles, 243.

¹⁸⁹ Chalkokondyles, 89.

Christian masses. An alternative legitimizing discourse for the Ottomans which aimed at Christians would, however, develop later in Ottoman history in an entirely different intellectual and social milieu. It too would borrow from the eclectic Near Eastern tradition of state legitimation.

Manuel Malaxos, Damaskenos the Stoudite and the Patriarchal History of Constantinople

The *Patriarchal History of Constantinople* (PHC) is the work of a sixteenth century churchman associated with the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul. It is the only extant text that focuses solely on patriarchal history, as opposed to late Byzantine or Ottoman history, and reference to Ottoman sultans and statesmen, though common, are tangential to narration of internal church affairs. The PHC is identified with the Greek scribe Manuel Malaxos and was written in 1577 or 1578.¹⁹⁰ The actual authorship of the chronicle is, however, debated.

The first page of the chronicle contains the following note:

[This work] is about the patriarchs who reigned in the universal church of this city of Constantine after Sultan Mehmed took it, and what happened in each time period, and who first gave the so-called *peşkeş* and *harac*, and who made increases [to it] up till now, and in which sultans' times these things happened. These things were translated into common speech by me, Manuel Malaxos the Peloponnesian, for Lord Martin Crusius in April 1577.¹⁹¹

Thus Malaxos cites himself as only the translator of the chronicle, though he may very well have altered the text in accordance with his own opinions and views. Scholars have shown that Malaxos definitely used the *Chronicon* of Damaskenos the

¹⁹⁰ The first page of the chronicle contains two contradictory dates.

¹⁹¹ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae, Ed. Immanuel Bekkerus, (Bonn: Impensis, 1849), 78. “περὶ τῶν πατριάρχων ὅπου ἐπατριάρχευσαν ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ταύτης τῆς Κωνσταντίνου πόλεως μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν ταύτην σουλτάν Μεχμετήν, καὶ τίνα γεγόνασιν ἐν τῷ ἑκάστου καιρῷ, καὶ ποῖος τὸ λεγόμενον πεσκέσιον καὶ τὸ χαράτζιον πρῶτον αὐτῷ δέδωκε, καὶ τίς τὴν αὖξῃσιν, ἣτις ὑπάρχει ἕως τοῦ νῦν, ἐποιήσατο, καὶ ἐν ποίου σουλτάνου καιρῷ ταῦτα γεγόνασιν. ἅτινα ἐμετεγλωττίσθησαν εἰς κοινὴν φράσιν παρ’ ἐμοῦ ΜΑΝΟΥΗΛ ΜΑΛΛΑΞΟΥ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ κυρῷ Μαρτίνῳ τῷ Κρουσίῳ ἐν ἔτει αφοῶζ’ μηνὶ ἀπριλίῳ.

Stoudite as a source, but the degree of reliance cannot be assessed until an edition of Damaskenos' chronicle is published.¹⁹² Attention to the identity of both of these figures is therefore warranted, since both of them probably left their marks on the extant text.

According to Börje Knös, Manuel Malaxos was born in Nauplion in Greece around the turn of the century but fled after it was conquered by Turkish armies in 1540. He began working for the metropolitan of Thebes in 1560, and in 1577 he moved to Istanbul to work as a teacher and calligrapher.¹⁹³ More recent scholarship by Giuseppe Gregorio has documented his years of work as a scribe in Italy from 1549 to 1560.¹⁹⁴ Martin Crusius recorded in his *Turcograecia* of 1584 that Malaxos was a "very old man [who] teaches Greek boys and adolescents in a small and wretched house near the Patriarchate in which he keeps dried fish hung up."¹⁹⁵

Damaskenos the Stoudite is said to have been born in 1535, most likely in Thessaloniki. He studied at the Patriarchal Academy in Istanbul, and he was later the teacher of Patriarch Jeremias II, the most lauded patriarch of the PHC. Biographical details for his life are not complete, but he is known to have spent time in both Istanbul and the monasteries of Meteora throughout the 1550s and to have been the metropolitan of Naupaktos and Arta when he died in 1577. He was a prominent intellectual of his time, and he authored the above-mentioned *Chronicon*, a *History of the Patriarchs of Constantinople*,¹⁹⁶ a homily collection entitled the *Thesaurus*, a book on zoology called the *Physiologia*, and many other works.¹⁹⁷ He is known to have written archaic Attic Greek very well, and thus most Greek readers of his time would have an easier time understanding Malaxos' translation into "common speech" than they would original works by Damaskenos.

¹⁹² Marios Philippides, "Damaskenos the Stoudite," *Historians of the Ottoman Empire*, Ed. C. Kafadar, H. Karateke, C. Fleischer, www.ottomanhistorians.com, 2008.

¹⁹³ Knös, Börje. *L'Histoire De La Litterature Neo-Grecque*. (Uppsala : Almqvist & Wiksell, 1962), 407.

¹⁹⁴ Giuseppe Gregorio, *Il Copista Greco Manouel Malaxos: Studio Biografico e Paleografico-Codicologico*, (Vatican City: Scuola Vaticana di Paleografia, Diplomatica, e Archivistica, 1991).

¹⁹⁵ Martin Crusius, *Turcograecia*, (Basel: Leonardum Ostenium, 1584), 185. "Est is admodum senex: pueros et adolescentulos Graecos, sub Patriarcheio, in parvula et misera casa docet: pisces siccatos, in ea suspensos habet."

¹⁹⁶ The manuscript of this text was last known to be at the Ecumenical Patriarchate Library in Istanbul, and the Patriarch of Constantinople, Bartholomeus, kindly granted me access to the library to study it. Unfortunately, it currently seems to be lost, and I can find no clues as to its whereabouts.

¹⁹⁷ Philippides, "Damaskenos the Stoudite."

Whether or not the extant PHC is primarily the work of Malaxos, Damaskenos, or any other author, it was surely the product of a churchman associated with the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Moreover, it is clear that the PHC was written in Istanbul, as it repeatedly refers to the capital city as “here.”¹⁹⁸ The chronicle itself is a collection of biographies of Patriarchs of Constantinople, beginning with Gennadios (1454-1464 with interruptions), who was appointed by Mehmed II upon his reestablishment of the patriarchate after the capture of the city. After an auspicious beginning, the PHC narrates a quick decline into “scandal” as Christian factions fight to out-bribe Ottoman officials in order to place their favorite candidates on the patriarchal throne. The text ends with an account of the reign of Jeremias II (1572-1595, with interruptions), who the author clearly favors over all other patriarchs. The PHC can be interpreted as a panegyric to him and his policies, as the author contrasts his integrity so sharply with the corruption that came before him. It states, for example, that Jeremias II “wanted to set right the Church of Christ...to remove and altogether uproot the evil tree...[i.e.] the most illegal and diabolical deed: Simony.”¹⁹⁹ The text has a narrative arc of rise, fall, and resurrection, and the author’s partisan treatment of patriarchs and his narrative framework should be read in the context of political infighting and interpreted with caution.

The PHC does not explicitly address the topic of legitimacy, but its author makes his belief in the legitimacy of Ottoman rule clear through his descriptions of sultans and his use of terminology. His depictions of Ottoman sultans as just arbiters and sometimes patrons of Christians can be interpreted as a legitimizing discourse for their rule aimed at pious Orthodox Christian subjects.

With regards to terminology, the PHC’s author consistently uses either the term βασιλεύς or σουλτάνος to refer to the Ottoman sultans. He also strongly implies that he considers the Ottomans to have become legitimate heirs of Byzantine rule after their capture of Constantinople through the manner in which he lists sultans. After the death

¹⁹⁸ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 97, 108, 150, 199.

¹⁹⁹ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 194. “...ἠθέλησε νὰ ὀρθοτομήσῃ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ χριστοῦ...νὰ εὐγάλῃ καὶ νὰ ἐξεριζώσῃ παντάπασι τὸ κακὸν δένδρον....λέγω τὸ παρανομώτατον καὶ διαβολικὸν ἔργον τὸ Σιμωνιακόν.”

of Bayezid II, for example, he writes that he had been “the second emperor,”²⁰⁰ and after the death of Sultan Selim, he describes him as having been “the third emperor,”²⁰¹ and so on.²⁰² This language implies that Mehmed II initiated a line of emperors who lawfully replaced their Byzantine predecessors. The PHC’s author never criticizes any Ottoman sultan, reserving any negative commentary for lower officials. On the contrary, he explicitly calls them “just.” For example, regarding Sultan Murat III, who was reigning at the time of the PHC’s composition, he writes,

When he sat upon the royal throne, he performed, and he [still] performs every day [acts of] great justice. He does not look upon the face of men [meaning that he is unbiased]; he only makes just rulings.²⁰³

Since the PHC’s author does not address the question of legitimacy directly, his views are best gleaned, after the general comments above, by detailed study of several anecdotes. The chronicle is replete with exaggerated, unbelievable, and sometimes racy stories, too many for comprehensive treatment here, but I will describe three that provide a glimpse into the author’s mindset. They are narratives about Mehmed II’s interactions with Patriarch Gennadios; an attempt by the Ottoman *ulema* to seize Christian churches and property in Istanbul during the reign of Sultan Süleyman; and direct appeal by the Christians of Galata to Sultan Süleyman for confirmation of their favorite candidate for the patriarchal throne.

Like Kritovoulos, the PHC’s author highly esteems and eulogizes Sultan Mehmed II above all others. He narrates how Mehmed II was angry that the Patriarch of Constantinople did not come to offer obeisance to him after his capture of Constantinople. Clerics explain, however, that there was no current patriarch. Mehmed therefore tells them to elect one, and he establishes Gennadios on the patriarchal throne in accordance with Byzantine custom. After Gennadios becomes patriarch, Mehmed

²⁰⁰ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 150. “Ἐπὶ τῆς πατριαρχείας τούτου τοῦ κυροῦ Παχωμίου ἀπέθανεν, ὡς εἶπαμεν, ὁ σουλτάνος, ὅπου ἦτον δεύτερος βασιλεύς.”

²⁰¹ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 151. “Λοιπὸν ἐπὶ τῆς πατριαρχείας αὐτοῦ, τοῦ κυροῦ Θεολήπτου, ἀπέθανεν, ὁ αὐτὸς σουλτᾶν Σελήμης, βασιλεύς, τρίτος...”

²⁰² At least one anonymous Turkish chronicle of the reign of Bayezid II also refers to the sultan as the “second Ceasar.”

²⁰³ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 199. “καὶ καθὼς ἐκάθισεν εἰς τὸν βασιλικὸν θρόνον, ἔκαμε, καὶ κάμνει καθ’ ἡμέραν, μεγάλας δικαιοσύνας καὶ πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου δὲν ἐβλέπει· μόνον τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνει.”

personally visits him, and Gennadios explains the Christian faith to him and gives him a written summary of the faith, which “was translated into the Turko-Arabic language.”²⁰⁴ After inserting the entire Greek version of the text into his chronicle, the PHC’s author writes,

When the sultan heard these [words] of the patriarch, which he gave to him in written form, he marveled greatly at his theology and his wisdom. He was assured of the complete truth concerning the faith of the Christians, that it is true and that the mysteries of their faith are true and miracle-working, and that there is not any guile in them. Rather they are pure and more brilliant than gold. He loved very much the Christian people, and he looked upon them benevolently. And he gave an order and made great threats to those who would harass or slander any of the Christians, that they would be punished heavily. And not only the sultan loved the Christians, but also all of the Muslims on account of the decree of their lord. The sultan was very glad and joyous to be the sovereign and emperor over such a people.²⁰⁵

Here the author of the PHC minimizes the religious gap between Christian Greeks and the Muslim sultan by describing Mehmed as a patron of Christians and even a believer at heart. Since this religious gap was the primary factor delegitimizing the Ottoman sultans in Christian eyes, this depiction of Mehmed as a believer in “the complete truth concerning the faith of the Christians” can itself be interpreted as one plank of the PHC’s legitimizing discourse.

In the most famous of anecdotes in the PHC, about an alleged attempt by the Ottoman *ulema* to seize all Orthodox Church property in Istanbul, the PHC depicts Sultan Süleyman as a just arbiter of affairs who ultimately guarantees the protection of Christian property for all time. The story goes that during the reign of Sultan Süleyman,

²⁰⁴ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 84. “Μετεγλωττίσθη δὲ εἰς τὴν Τουρκοαραβόγλωσσα ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀχμέτ, καδδῆ βερροίας, τοῦ πατρὸς Μαχουμουτ Τζελεμπι τοῦ ἀναγραφέως.” See also, Tibor Halasi-Kun, “Gennadios’ Turkish Confession of Faith,” *Archivum Ottomanicum* 12 (1987-92).

²⁰⁵ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 93-94. “Ὁ δὲ σουλτάνος ἀκούσας ταῦτα τοῦ πατριάρχου, ἅπερ ἐγγράφως τοῦ ἔδωκε, ἐθαύμασε μέγας εἰς τὴν θεολογίαν καὶ σοφίαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπληροφόρηθη τὴν πᾶσαν ἀλήθειαν περὶ τῆς πίστεως τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ὅτι ἔναι ἀληθινή, καὶ τὰ μυστήρια τῆς πίστεως αὐτῶν ἀληθινὰ καὶ θαυματουργά, καὶ κανένα δόλος δὲν εἶναι εἰς αὐτά, ἀμὴ καθαρὰ καὶ λαμπρότερα ὑπὲρ τὸ χρυσάφι. ἀγάπησε δὲ πολλὰ τὸ γένος τῶν χριστιανῶν, καὶ ἔβλεπε καλῶς. καὶ ὀρισμὸν ἔδωκε, καὶ ἔκαμε καὶ μεγάλας φοβέρας εἰς ἐκείνους ὅπου νὰ πηράζουν ἢ διαβάλλουν τινὰ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, νὰ παιδεύονται βαρέως· καὶ οὐχὶ μόνον ὁ σουλτάνος ἀγάπα τοὺς χριστιανοὺς, ἀμὴ καὶ ὅλοι οἱ μουσουλμάνοι ἔνεκεν τοῦ ὀρισμοῦ τοῦ ἀφεντός. εἶχε δὲ ὁ σουλτάνος μεγάλην χαρὰν καὶ εὐφροσύνην, ἔσοντας νὰ γένῃ τοιοῦτου γένους αὐθέντης καὶ βασιλέας.”

“all the learned and wise men of the Turks”²⁰⁶ gathered and produced a *fetva* stating that since Mehmed II captured Istanbul “by the blade,”²⁰⁷ Islamic law permitted the conquerors to commandeer all of the city’s churches. They planned to use this *fetva* to justify the destruction and confiscation of Christian property in Istanbul, but beforehand a Christian noble, Xenakis, who was a friend of the Ottoman *kazasker*, discovered the plot and informed Patriarch Jeremias. The PHC’s author writes that the patriarch’s first reaction was to weep before the church icons, but soon he collected himself and visited the grand vizier Toulphi Pasha²⁰⁸ (Lütfi Paşa). Together with the grand vizier, the patriarch and his allies concocted a story about the last Byzantine Emperor Constantine’s capitulation of the city, and they found aged Janissaries to attest to their story. These aged witnesses appeared before the imperial *divan*, and in a very dramatic scene they described the fall of the city and the Emperor Constantine’s last-minute capitulation. Sultan Süleyman supposedly responded with a decree ensuring that there “not be any further temptation or trouble concerning the issue of the churches, until the world comes to an end.”²⁰⁹

Traditionally, experts on Greek literature have argued that this story is largely fabricated, while an actual attempt by the Ottoman *ulema* to seize Christian property occurred during the reign of Sultan Selim.²¹⁰ The event, including reference to the aged Janissary witnesses, is, however, attested in Ottoman *Şeyhülislâm* Ebu’s-su’ud’s *Mâruzat*, which explicitly states that the matter was investigated in 1538.²¹¹ Thus it seems that Sultan Süleyman and the Ottoman *divan* did ultimately devise some sort of legal fiction to protect the Christian community of Istanbul from property confiscation. The story is relevant for this thesis because the PHC describes these frightening events with total acceptance of the authority of the Ottoman state and its institutions, without

²⁰⁶ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 158. “ὅλοι οἱ γραμματικοὶ καὶ σοφοὶ τῶν Τουρκῶν.”

²⁰⁷ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 158. “ἀπὸ σπαθίου.”

²⁰⁸ A transliteration of the Greek spelling for Lütfi Paşa.

²⁰⁹ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 168. “μὴ δὲν ἔχει πλέον κανέναν πειρασμὸν οὐδὲ ἐνόχλησιν περὶ τῆς τοιαύτης ὑποθέσεως τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ἕως οὗ στέκεται ὁ κόσμος.”

²¹⁰ See Christos Patrinelis, “The Exact Time of the First Attempt of the Turks to Seize the Churches and Convert the Christian People of Constantinople to Islam,” *Actes du Premier Congrès International des Etudes Balkaniques et Sud-Est Européens* III (1969), 571.

²¹¹ See Ahmed Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri ve Hukuki Tahlilleri*, Vol. 4, (İstanbul, FEY Vakfı, 1990), 58-59.

any cries afoul which appear in other chronicles of the period about Ottoman “impiety” or “illegality.” Moreover, it depicts Sultan Süleyman as a fair and unbiased arbiter who listens to the appeals of his subjects and judges them according to their merits in accordance with Islamic law.

The last anecdote that I will describe is the only one in the PHC in which Sultan Süleyman participated personally outside of the *divan*. The PHC states that a synod of high churchmen met in order to curb simony and to ban the election of patriarchs without the convention of a full synod. They issued a scroll that all signed, and afterwards it was sent to a *kadı* and made official.²¹² Soon thereafter, its injunction was violated by the unlawful election of Patriarch Dionysios (1546-1556), formerly the Nichomedian metropolitan, to the patriarchal throne. When Christian notables heard of the election, they became enraged and questioned the priests involved. The priests who elected him defended themselves by claiming that they had been physically forced to support him. According to the PHC they said,

Some held us by the feet, others by the hands, and yet others by the waist. They tore our priestly headgear and veils to the ground, confined us bareheaded in the church, and told us [their] resolution: “Either make the Nichomedian patriarch, or we will kill you.”²¹³

Dionysios’ position was weak, as most clergy and notables opposed him, as did the grand vizier Rüstem Pasha, who the PHC refers to as “the great enemy of the patriarch.”²¹⁴ His only allies were the residents of Galata because he was “born and brought up there.”²¹⁵ Thus his supporters supposedly took advantage of a chance opportunity to seek Süleyman’s personal intercession:

And one day the emperor went by sea to Camelogephyrum, and when these Christians learned this, they ran there carrying a supplication. They made obeisance and gave it [to him]. And the emperor, when they came to his palace (*seraglio*), read the supplication, and then he summoned Rüstem and reproached him many times concerning this. Finally he stated his decision: “May the will of

²¹² *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 172.

²¹³ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 175-176. “καὶ τινὲς ἐβάσταζαν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τὰ ποδάρια, ἄλλοι ἀπὸ τὰ χέρια καὶ ἄλλοι ἀπὸ τὴν μέσιν. καὶ τὰ καμιλάχια ἡμῶν καὶ τὰ σοκαμίλουχα ἔρρηξαν κατὰ γῆς, καὶ ἀσκεπεῖς ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐσφάλισαν, καὶ ἀπόφασιν εἰς μᾶς ἐξεφώνησαν, ὅτι ἢ τὸν Νικομηδείας νὰ κάμετε πατριάρχην, ἢ νὰ σὰς θανατώσωμεν.”

²¹⁴ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 176. “ὁ Πουσταπασιάς ἐχθρὸς μέγας τοῦ πατριάρχου.”

²¹⁵ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 173. “ἐκεῖ ἐγεννήθη, καὶ ἐκεῖ ἀνετράφη.”

my people come to be.” The pasha, not knowing what to do, for fear of the emperor, sent a sergeant and took the patriarch from Galata, where he was to be found after being chased there, and he brought him to the patriarchate and sat him on the patriarchal throne.²¹⁶

Dionysios reigned as patriarch until he died naturally in 1556. In this story, as in almost all of his others, the PHC’s author accepts unquestioningly the authority of the sultan to determine the Christian community’s fate without demur, and he depicts Süleyman as a just arbiter. Although the episode results in a decision that the author clearly regards as unjust, he places the blame on the machinations of Dionysios, as Süleyman made the most just ruling possible with the information and his will was above reproach.

Thus the PHC’s author suppresses any criticism of the Ottoman sultanate while acknowledging their legitimacy. He does this through his choice of wording, such as his use of the word “emperor” to refer to sultans, and depiction of the sultans as propagators of rule once held by Byzantine emperors. Moreover, the three passages described above contain legitimizing discourses based on two foundations: depiction of the sultan as a just and unbiased judge, and, in the case of Mehmed II, a patron of Christians who may even have been a Christian at heart.

Although the PHC’s author emphasizes his Christian identity, his means of legitimizing the Ottoman sultanate stems from intellectual roots that go much farther back than Christianity. The concept of ruler as patron, or *patronus* in Latin, of his subjects and various groups of subjects is, of course, an ancient component of Roman social relations and statecraft. More importantly, the word for “justice” used in the PHC (δικαίωσυνη) is ancient and was used in Classical Greek discussions of political theory of the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. Herodotus’ use of the word is particularly striking because he describes exactly the archetype of ruler as unbiased judge and aider of the oppressed that formed the core of the “near-eastern theory of state,” to borrow

²¹⁶ *Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia*, 177. “καὶ μιᾷ ὑπῆγεν ὁ βασιλεὺς διὰ θαλάσσης εἰς τὸ καμηλογέφυρον. καὶ ὡς ἔμαθαν τοῦτο οἱ Χριστιανοί, ἔδραμαν ἐκεῖ, βαστόντα τὸν ῥοκᾶν, καὶ ἔτζη ἐπροσκύνηαν καὶ τὸν ἔδωκαν. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ὡς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸ σαράγιον αὐτοῦ ἀνέγνωσε τὸν ῥοκᾶν, καὶ τῆς ὥρας ἔκραξε τὸν Ῥουσταπασιᾶν, καὶ πολλὰ τὸν ὀνειδίσεν περὶ τούτου. τέλος τοῦ εἶπε κατὰ ἀπόφασιν ‘νὰ γένει τὸ θέλημα τοῦ λαοῦ μου.’ καὶ ὁ πασιᾶς μὴ ἔχων, τὶ νὰ κάμη ἀπὸ τὸν φόβον τοῦ βασιλέως, ἔπεμψε τζαούση καὶ ἐπῆρε τὸν πατριάρχην ἀπὸ τὸν Γαλατᾶν, ὅπου εὗρίσκετον ἐκεῖ διωγμένος, καὶ τὸν ἤφερεν εἰς τὸ πατριαρχεῖον, καὶ ἐκάθισεν εἰς τὸν θρόνον τὸν πατριαρχικόν.”

Halil Inalcik's phrase.²¹⁷ Herodotus describes how Deiokes, a wise Mede, was "enamored by sovereignty" (I.96).²¹⁸ To convince the Medes, who were free at that time, to make him their ruler, he consciously "pursued and practiced justice (δικαιοσύνη)" (I.96),²¹⁹ ultimately becoming a great judge among the Medes. One day Deiokes stopped giving judgments in order to show the Medes their dependence upon him, and chaos ensued. They unanimously gave him authority and kingship, and he "united the Median people" (I.101).²²⁰ Thereafter he continued to rule as a just and unbiased judge and arbiter.

The term δικαιοσύνη appears throughout the Greek Testament and Patristic Greek literature, and it was also in "ubiquitous" use in Byzantine court oratory.²²¹ Moreover, the Ottomans considered it the sultan's "fundamental duty" to distribute justice, or *adalet*, in the *divan-ı hümayun*, or imperial council.²²² Thus, by depicting the Ottoman sultan as a just arbiter both in and outside of the *divan*, the author of the PHC utilizes an image that had both Classical and Christian resonances and which was also a central component of Ottoman propaganda and their own self-understanding. The PHC author's decision to emphasize this line of argument must certainly have been influenced by the Ottoman intellectual context.

While these two arguments stem from ancient tradition, the PHC's implication that Mehmed II was some sort of Christian was novel fabrication. It seems that the author ultimately still had some difficulty fully accepting Muslim rule and that such acceptance could only come by depicting the sultan as a Christian. The PHC's audience is clearly fellow Orthodox churchmen, as the work is almost entirely concerned with internal church politics. Given that the Ecumenical Patriarchate had been co-opted by the Ottoman state during Mehmed II's reign and that close ties between Porte and Patriarchate continued throughout the Ealy Modern Period,²²³ it must have been

²¹⁷ Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age, 1300-1600*, trans. Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), 68.

²¹⁸ Herodotus, *The Histories* (Greek text), The Perseus Digital Library, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>. "ἐρασθεὶς τυραννίδος."

²¹⁹ Herodotus. "δικαιοσύνην ἐπιθέμενος ἤσκειε."

²²⁰ Herodotus. "τὸ Μηδικὸν ἔθνος συνέστρεψε."

²²¹ Angelov, 134.

²²² İnalcık, 90.

²²³ For an investigation of the Ecumenical Patriarchate's role in Ottoman taxation, see Anastasios G. Papademetriou, "Ottoman Tax Farming and the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate: An Examination of State and Church in Ottoman Society (15-16th

particularly important to justify the relationship between the Patriarchate and Mehmed, who established the governing *status quo*.

In sum, the author of the PHC uses wording and narrative to craft legitimizing discourses for Ottoman rule. Although his arguments are aimed at pious Christians, none of them are inherently Christian, deriving instead from ancient near-eastern tradition. The subtle tension between the author's Christianity and his pro-Ottoman stance reveals itself in his attempt to Christianify Sultan Mehmed II.

Papasynadinos and his Chronicle of Serres

The legitimizing discourses of the PHC, based on depictions of the sultan as unbiased judge, must have been accepted by many educated Orthodox Christians of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, as a similar line of argument appears in another chronicle of the period deriving from a provincial context, namely Papasynadinos' *Chronicle of Serres*. Papasynadinos was born in 1600 to a clergyman in the village of Melenikitsi. Judging from his chronicle, he seems to have lived his entire life serving as a clergyman in the Serres region. His chronicle covers events that occurred between 1598 and 1642 and is based both on first and second-hand accounts. He writes in vernacular Greek but within the genre of Byzantine *chronographia*. His conception of the "world," however, is Ottoman territories, and his worldview is that of an Ottoman subject.²²⁴ He clearly conveys his belief in the justice and legitimacy of the Ottoman sultanate, and his legitimizing discourse for Ottoman rule overlaps with that of the PHC.

Unlike the PHC, Papasynadinos' *Chronicle of Serres* and its legitimizing discourse for Ottoman rule has come to the attention of contemporary scholars. In a recent article entitled "The Ottoman State and Its Orthodox Christian Subjects: The Legitimizing Discourse in the Seventeenth-Century 'Chronicle of Serres,'" in a New

Century)," Princeton University Near Eastern Languages and Cultures Dissertation, 2001.

²²⁴ Johann Strauss, "Ottoman Rule Experienced and Remembered: Remarks on Some Local Greek Chronicles of the *Tourkokratia*," *The Ottomans and the Balkans: A Discussion of Historiography*, Ed. Fikret Adanır and Suraiya Faroqhi, (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 196-199.

Perspective,” Olga Todorova argues that Papasynadionos’ perspective must have been influenced by Ottoman discourses. Although Papasynadinos lamented the fall of Byzantium²²⁵ and described serious inter-communal animosity between Muslims and Christians in seventeenth century Serres,²²⁶ Papasynadinos conveys unambiguous belief in the legitimacy of the Ottomans. For example, like the author of the PHC, Kritovoulos, and Chalkokondyles, Papasynadionos uses the word βασιλεύς to describe sultans,²²⁷ and he bids Christians to “fear the *basileus*...and pay the royal taxes.”²²⁸ Moreover, he identifies with and rejoices Ottoman victories at war²²⁹ and conveys great appreciation for several sultans, most notably Murad IV, about whom he wrote that “never again in their whole lives will the Christians find such a [good] emperor.”²³⁰ Todorova argues that this enthusiasm for the Ottoman sultanate derives from the sultan’s role in protecting subjects from abuses by state officials.

Todorova comes to this conclusion by analyzing several anecdotes. During a visit to Serres in 1626, for example, Murat IV’s envoy Kenan Pasha “managed to crush some of the most brutal oppressors of the population in the region,”²³¹ executing a tax-collector and two Ottoman officials who had executed subjects without trial. As a result of the sultan’s intervention, Papasynadinos states that “the ‘Turks’ mended their ways and stopped their ‘misdeeds’,”²³² and he exults in the new state of affairs. Todorova also describes how a sultanic ‘trustee’ intervened in local justice and saved a Christian who had been unjustly condemned to execution for money-forging.²³³

In other passages, Papasynadinos reveals that he saw the imperial *divan* as a distributor of just decrees and a defender of Christian subjects against corrupt officials. He describes, for example, how one such official executed a Christian who planned to make appeal to the *divan*, implying that had the Christian arrived in Istanbul, justice

²²⁵ Olga Todorova, “The Ottoman State and its Orthodox Christian Subjects: The Legitimistic Discourse in the Seventeenth Century ‘Chronicle of Serres’ in a New Perspective,” *Turkish Historical Review* 1 (2010): 92.

²²⁶ Todorova, 91.

²²⁷ Todorova, 92.

²²⁸ As quoted in Todorova, 92.

²²⁹ Todorova, 94.

²³⁰ As quoted in Todorova, 95.

²³¹ Todorova, 96.

²³² Todorova, 97.

²³³ Todorova, 99.

would have been done.²³⁴ Moreover, the author's father had travelled to Istanbul to request that tax rates in Serres, and he eventually succeeded in his mission.

Papasynadinos was not an unquestioning panegyrist of Ottoman rule, but he clearly deemed the dynasty to rule legitimacy and to be just patrons of Christians against local corruption. This vision of the Ottoman state overlaps extensively with the Ottomans' own understanding of themselves. Todorova notes that in Islamic political thought "the wellbeing of society depended above all on the care and vigilance of the ruler who was expected to ensure a proper balance between the different social strata and thus to guarantee order and harmony."²³⁵ Ottoman sultans were urged in panegyric literature to uphold a "Circle of Justice," and Todorova argues that Papasynadinos seems to have internalized the concept as well. As discussed above with reference to the PHC, this aspect of Ottoman political theory overlaps with much more ancient principles of Near Eastern statecraft. It cannot be coincidental, however, that Papasynadinos, the author of the PHC, and the Ottoman state focused on the same strand of argument from among the myriad ones that comprise the Near Eastern tradition of political theory.

Conclusions

In sum, Greek authors writing in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire did craft normative arguments for the legitimacy of Ottoman rule that were aimed at Greek-speaking Christian subjects. Two lines of argument are evident. On the one hand, late fifteenth century former Byzantine elites developed a "secular," or "Classical" argument based on the Ottomans' merit and perception that the Ottomans lay in a long succession of empires which all shared equal legitimacy regardless of the ruling classes' religion. On the other hand, one late sixteenth century author and one early seventeenth century author described the Ottoman sultans as just arbiters who could be trusted to defend their Christian subjects. Whereas the former argument evolved out of the Greek literary tradition and would have been most appealing to educated elite Greeks, the later

²³⁴ Todorova, 98.

²³⁵ Todorova, 101.

argument overlaps with Ottoman political theory and would have had broader appeal among churchmen and common subjects.

Chapter V: Conclusions

This thesis has shown that Greek chronicler writers of the Early Modern Period expressed a diversity of views regarding the legitimacy of the Ottoman sultanate. While some clearly considered Ottoman rule to be illegitimate, one author accepted their legitimacy out of “habit,” while others borrowed from ancient Classical tradition to develop legitimizing discourses in support of the Ottomans aimed at Greek-speaking Orthodox Christian subjects. In this conclusion, I will consider whether or not patterns can be established connecting geography, time-period, and projected audience with authors’ views on the legitimacy of the Ottoman state. I will then move on to consider these authors’ views from a broader Mediterranean prospective.

Place, Time, and Audience

Of the nine chroniclers under consideration in this thesis, three are known to have been written by authors living under Ottoman rule: Kritovoulos, the author of the PHC, and Papasynadinos. Two of the chroniclers, Sphrantzes and Melissourgos-Melissenos are known to have put pen to paper outside of Ottoman domains, in Venetian Corfu and Naples, respectively, after having fled the Ottomans. Four of the chronicles, however, were written at unknown whereabouts. Doukas’ fate after the Ottoman assault on Lesbos is unknown, as is the whereabouts of Chalkokondyles when he wrote his chronicle, though scholars have postulated Athens, Crete, and Italy as the most likely

places. No hard evidence exists for the anonymous *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans* or for the *Codex Oxoniensis Lincolnensis*.

Because four of the chronicles were written at unknown locations, it is impossible to make absolute conclusions regarding the relation between authors' views and geography. It is noteworthy, however, that all of the authors known to have written outside of Ottoman domains were anti-Ottoman, whereas all of those who are known to have written within Ottoman domains were pro-Ottoman. Both of the authors who are known to have written outside of Ottoman domains had, however, been living in Ottoman lands until they fled because of distaste for the regime. Whether they could have written with the same anti-Ottoman fervor or been restricted by censorship had they remained is difficult to ascertain.

With regards to the variable of time, four of the authors under consideration, Kritovoulos, Chalkokondyles, Doukas, and Sphrantzes wrote during the fifteenth century; three of them, the author of the PHC, Melissourgos-Melissenos, and the anonymous author of the *Codex Oxoniensis Lincolnensis*, wrote during the sixteenth century; and two of them, Papasynadinos and the author of the *Chronicle of Turkish Sultans*, wrote in the seventeenth century. Given that the last two works, along with the PHC, are all patently pro-Ottoman, I am inclined to posit that over time, as first-hand memory of Christian sovereignty in Byzantine lands diminished, acceptance for and accommodation to the Ottomans must have increased gradually. The sample size of these chronicles, however, is too small to substantiate this suggestion numerically.

Finally, two sources of evidence exist that imply the audiences of these chronicles: internal clues and the distribution of manuscripts. Both Doukas and Sphrantzes wrote explicitly for close friends and local acquaintances, though the manuscripts of their texts appear in Western Europe, at Paris²³⁶ and Munich, respectively. Kritovoulos submitted his history to the Porte itself, and the only copy exists in the Topkapı Palace Museum Library.²³⁷ Chalkokondyles' text survives in twenty-nine codices scattered throughout Western Europe, in the Vatican, Paris,

²³⁶ Harry J. Magoulias, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975), 40.

²³⁷ Charles T. Riggs, *History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, (Princeton University Press, 1954), ix.

London, Tübingen, and other academic libraries,²³⁸ and it was clearly written for a wide range of educated Greek-readers. The *Patriarchal History of Constantinople*, as previously mentioned, was ultimately published in Martin Crusius' *Turcograecia* and does not exist in manuscript form, although the original text aimed at Orthodox churchmen in the Ottoman Empire. Copies of the *Chronicon Maius* of Melissourgos-Melissenos are preserved all over the Balkans, but the oldest ones are in Milan, Rome, Turin, and Vatican City.²³⁹ Melissourgos-Melissenos, based in Naples, sought to reach a Greek-reading popular audience throughout Italy and the Eastern Mediterranean. The *Codex Oxoniensis-Lincolnensis* exists in a single manuscript at Lincoln College, Oxford,²⁴⁰ and it seems to have been aimed at a general Greek reading audience in Ottoman lands, Venetian territories, and in Italy, given the generality of topics addressed and the anti-Ottoman nature of the work. The *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans* survives in one manuscript, the *Codex Barberinus Graecus III* located in the Vatican, and it targeted a similarly diverse audience. Papasynadinos' regional chronicle pandered to a local audience, and it survives in one manuscript found at Mt. Athos.²⁴¹

Renaissance humanists' efforts to collect and to preserve Greek texts explain why most of these manuscripts survive in Italy as opposed to Ottoman lands, where they most certainly had readership but fewer centers for preservation. Thus the evidence of manuscript distribution is distorted. Internal evidence does not allow for easy generalization either, as the data is contradictory: authors with similar audiences, such as Melissourgos-Melissenos and the author of the *Chronicle of Turkish Sultans*, articulated opposite opinions. It is therefore best not to generalize beyond the comments made in Chapter IV.

In sum, the diversity of opinion represented in these nine chronicles are difficult to account for on the basis of time, place of composition, or audience. For any rule there is an exception. For example, while the author of the PHC, a sixteenth century

²³⁸ Nicolaos Nicoloudis, *Laonikos Chalkokondyles: A Translation and Commentary of the 'Demonstrations of Histories' (Books I-III)*, (Athens: St. D. Basilopoulos, 1996), 65.

²³⁹ Marios Philippides, "Makarios Melissourgos-Melissenos," *Historians of the Ottoman Empire*, Ed. C. Kafadar, H. Karateke, C. Fleischer, www.ottomanhistorians.com, 2008.

²⁴⁰ Many thanks to my thesis advisor, Professor Metin Kunt, for tracking down its whereabouts.

²⁴¹ Paolo Odorico, *Conseils et Memoires de Synadinos Pretre de Serres en Macedoine (XVIIe Siecle)*, (Paris: Pierre Belon, 1996), 9.

churchman endorsed the legitimacy of the Ottoman sultanate, Melissourgios-Melissenos, another sixteenth century churchman, entered into open revolt against Ottoman rule. While Kritovoulos, a late Byzantine elite from Imbros embraced Ottoman suzerainty, Doukas, a late-Byzantine elite from Lesbos, did not. Understanding lies in the details.

Turks, Greeks, and Italians: A Shared Intellectual World?

As described in the introduction, both Byzantines and Ottomans employed an eclectic array of images and arguments to bolster the legitimacy of their rule. This thesis has shown that Greek authors loyal to the Ottoman dynasty also drew from this eclectic near-eastern tradition to adapt to changing times, and that, in the case of the PHC and the *Chronicle of Serres*, arguments overlapped with Ottoman state propaganda. Overall, one is left with the impression that Muslim Ottoman subjects and Greek Christian ones shared common intellectual influences and that there was a potential for intellectual mutual interaction.

Such mutual interaction would, at least, be logical, as there were always educated Greeks and bilinguals at the court of the Ottoman sultans. For example, in addition to Kritovoulos, Mehmed II's clients included George Amiroukis of Trabzon, a scholar who inhabited, according to Kritovoulos, the "summit of philosophy."²⁴² Kritovoulos documents how he drafted a map of the world for Mehmed II based on the geography of Ptolemy.²⁴³ The PHC also mentions "the son of Amiroutzi, Mehmed Bey," describing him as being

...most learned and wise in Greek and Arabic learning. He was so wise that he translated our own Christian books into the Arabic language by order of the sultan. For the sultan never ceased from questioning the son of Amiroutzi, as a wise man, and other wise men whom he had in his *saray*, about the faith of us Christians, [and] they explained these things in great detail. He took great pleasure in listening to these things.²⁴⁴

²⁴² Kritovoulos, *Critobuli Imbriotae Historiae*, Ed. Diether Roderich Reinsch, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1983), 165. "φιλοσοφίαν ἄκρος."

²⁴³ Kritovoulos, 195.

²⁴⁴ *Patriarchica Constantinopoleos Historia, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae*, Ed. Immanuel Bekkerus, (Bonn: Impensis, 1849), 117-118. "ἀπὸ τοὺς ὁποίους ἦτον ὁ

Mehmed II initiated translation projects and encouraged intellectual life among Greeks throughout the later years of his reign.²⁴⁵

Just as Mehmed II had educated Greeks at his court, so had thousands of educated Greeks flocked from Byzantine lands to the courts of Italian princes, the Pope, and the financial centers of Italy throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.²⁴⁶ Much research has been done showing how these émigrés helped to catalyze the Renaissance and Renaissance Humanism, and the result was an overlap between the thought-worlds of educated Byzantine Greeks and Renaissance humanists based on a shared canon. In the *Prince*, for example, written in 1505, Machiavelli discusses the status of a ruler who gains power through fortune versus merit in Chapters VI and VII, entitled “Concerning New Principalities which are Acquired by One’s Own Arm and Ability,” and “Concerning New Principalities which are Acquired by the Arms of Others or by Good Fortune,” respectively.²⁴⁷ His vocabulary and categories overlap with those of Chalkokondyles, Kritovoulos, and other Classicizing authors writing in Ottoman domains because all of these authors were influenced by the same Classical sources.

Thus, shared intellectual influences and the existence of Greek scholars in all of the urban centers of the Eastern Mediterranean, both Ottoman and Italian, provided enough common points of reference to have made intellectual interaction between Greeks, Italians, and Ottomans possible. One could even speak of a shared intellectual zone in the Eastern Mediterranean that overlapped with the economic and diplomatic ones that are so much better understood. The degree to which this potential for interaction was fulfilled, however, is unknown, and very basic questions remain. How

ἕνας, υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀμηρούτζη, ὁ Μεχεμέτ πεῖς, λογιώτατος καὶ σοφώτατος εἰς τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν μάθημα καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἀραβικόν. τόσον γὰρ ἦτον σοφώτατος ὅτι τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἐδικά μας τῶν Χριστιανῶν τὰ ἐμεταγλώττισε εἰς τὴν Ἀραβικὴν γλῶσσαν διὰ ὀρισμοῦ τοῦ σουλτάνου. ὁ γὰρ σουλτάνος δὲν ἔπαυε ποτὲ νὰ μηδὲν ἐρωτᾷ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Ἀμηρούτζη ὡς σοφὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ἄλλους σοφοὺς ὅπου εἶχε μέσα εἰς τὸ σαρὰγι του, περὶ τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν, οἱ ὅποιοι τὰ ἐξηγήθησαν καταλεπτῶς· καὶ εἶχε χαρὰν μεγάλην, ἀκούοντα ταῦτα.” For more on Amiroutzis, see Asterios Argyriou and G. Lagarrique, “Georges Amiroutzes et son Dialogue sur la Foi au Christ Tenu avec le Sultan des Turcs,” *Byzantinische Forschungen* 11 (1987).

²⁴⁵ See J. Raby, “Mehmed the Conqueror’s Greek Scriptorium,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 37 (1983): 15-34.

²⁴⁶ See John Monfasani, *Byzantine Scholars in Renaissance Italy: Cardinal Bessarion and Other Emigres*, (Hampshire: Variorum, 1995).

²⁴⁷ See, Nicola Machiavelli, *The Prince*, Trans. W.K. Marriott, (Gloucester: Dodo Press, 2005).

common was it, for example, for Ottoman Muslim intellectuals to read works in Greek, or for Christian intellectuals to read ones in Ottoman?²⁴⁸ Examples are known, but the question has not been addressed systematically.

This thesis has shown how Ottoman Greeks drew upon ancient tradition to interpret contemporary times, and it has implied that some were intellectually influenced by their context in the Ottoman Empire. In future work, I will continue to build upon this final conclusion by looking for further examples of the influence of Ottoman Turkish authors and state propaganda on Greek texts and by reading Ottoman sources that make explicit reference to Greek books and to Byzantine history. Ultimately, I would like to understand the degree to which this potential for a shared intellectual world in the Eastern Mediterranean of the Early Modern Period was realized.

²⁴⁸ For some clues, see Stephane Yerasimos, *La Foundation de Constantinople et de Sainte-Sophie dans les Traditions Turques*, (Paris: Institut Francais D'Etudes Anatoliennes D'Istanbul, 1990) and Gottfried Hagen, "Katip Çelebi," *Historians of the Ottoman Empire*, Ed. C. Kafadar, C. Fleischer, H. Karateke, www.ottomanhistorians.com, 2008.

The Patriarchal History of Constantinople: From 1454 until 1578

[This work] is about the patriarchs who reigned in the universal church of this city of Constantine after Sultan Mehmed took it, and what happened in each time period, and who first gave the so-called *peşkeş* and *harac*, and who made increases [to it] up till now, and in which sultans' times these things happened. These things were translated into common speech by me, Manuel Malaxos the Peloponnesian, for Lord Martin Crusius in April 1577.

At the time when Sultan Mehmet waged war on Constantinople, the [number of] years were one thousand four hundred and fifty three from [the time of] Christ's birth, Tuesday May 29th. [79] He knew that the Romans had always had a patriarch because he spent much time here around the city before he took it, being in Adrianople where his father, Sultan Murat, was ruling. And he knew the [affairs] of the Romans well and subtly, as well as their classes. He marveled at how the patriarch did not come to make obeisance [before him] as lord. He became very angry and wondered why this was so. Then he called out to the clerics and said, "Where is your patriarch? Has he not come to make obeisance before me as emperor?" For this sultan wanted very much to speak with the patriarch about the faith and to ask and to learn about divine things. The clerics, however, said that "We have not had a patriarch for a long time, as the patriarch who had been [in office] voluntarily gave up his seat while still living, and from that time we have not appointed another." When the sultan heard this, his anger abated. He issued them a decree and [asked] them whom they wanted to appoint, according to their faith. And the sultan said this, that they [should] appoint a patriarch, with guile, so that the Christians would hear that they have a patriarch and so that they would rush to the city.

[80] Then the clerics, according to the decree of the sultan, convened some of the high priests at hand. When the synod met they all unanimously elected the wisest Lord

George Scholarios, who had been a judge of the royal court in the days of the emperors of the Romans. And when Emperor John Palaiologos went to *Francia*, where they held the eighth synod, he also took him along, as he was most wise. He was a very holy and pious man. When they gave him the small [informal] summons in order to make him patriarch, he did not want to listen or to consent to becoming patriarch. But the high priests and clerics and all the people made him patriarch by compulsion, giving him the great [formal] summons.²⁴⁹ The Heracleian ordained him with the other high priests in the Church of the Holy Apostles, which Empress Theodora built, she who had been the wife of the great Emperor Justinian, and they named him Gennadios.

Gennadios Scholarios the Wise

This [man] became the first patriarch in Constantinople [81] from the time that this sultan ruled over it, as we have written. And when they made him patriarch, the high priests and clerics and the first men of the people took him, and he went and made obeisance before the sultan. He asked the clerics there what custom the emperors of the Romans practiced when they made a patriarch. They replied to him and said that “whenever [someone] became patriarch, [the emperor] granted him a caped garment with brocade, a mantle with the rivers,²⁵⁰ and a white horse, and he would mount it and go around the city. He would bless [the city], and the emperor would give him the staff with his hand. And so the sultan received the staff with his hand, and he placed it in the hand of the patriarch. He gave an order, and all these things came to pass which we have said, whatever beneficences the patriarchs had had from the emperors. The sultan loved the patriarch very much, having learned that he was a very wise and pious man. He also granted him the famous Church of the Holy Apostles and made it the Patriarchate. And there, where the patriarch was to sit, one night a man was found slaughtered. And [the patriarch] feared greatly lest they slaughter him or [someone] in his entourage there, because all the area around the patriarchate was deserted, as nobody

²⁴⁹ For explanation of the “formal” and “informal” summonses, see Christopher Walter, *Art and Ritual of the Byzantine Church*, (London: Variorum, 1982), 136.

²⁵⁰ See Walter, 30.

lived [82] there because they died in the war. At once the patriarch departed from there and abandoned the church after it had been fastened shut. He went to the sultan, and he related the things that had happened and beseeched him to grant him the Monastery of Pammakaristos in order to make it the patriarchate. The sultan, when he heard this, gave his order right away, and he took the Church of the Pammakaristos of the most pure Theotokos, and he made it the patriarchate, which Lord God our Savior Christ will withhold from any enemy, undisturbed and unharmed, until the end of time. All [the area] outside and around this Church of the Pammakaristos was inhabited by people. The whole vicinity was filled with lodgings, both above and below, because they were brining exiles (*sürgün*) from the other strongholds and settling them there. Since the entire area of the Pammakaristos was full of people, the patriarch beseeched the sultan, and [the sultan] gave him that church. He settled there and made it the Patriarchate, as we have said. This Pammakaristos had been a convent in the time of the Romans. And they made the Church of the Holy Apostles, at which the patriarch had sat before, an *imaret* of Sultan Mehmet. Edifices from this church stand to this day.

[83] Then the same sultan went physically to the patriarchate, to the Church of the Pammakaristos, and he went into the chapel where the sacristy is today. He conversed and discoursed with the patriarch, Lord Gennadios, and the patriarch explained to him all the truth of our faith, without any fear. He wrote for his inquiries twenty chapters, which appear below, one by one, what [the faith] says, and he gave them to the sultan. And the beginning of the chapters [commences] in this way:

A discourse on the true and immaculate faith of the Christians by the most wise and learned Lord Gennadios Scholarios, Patriarch of Constantinople, the New Rome. For he was asked by the Emir Sultan Mehmet, “What do you Christians believe?” He replied as follows.

Chapter 1: We believe that there is a God, maker of all things, as much as exist, from non-existence to existence. He neither is a body nor has a body, but he lives mentally, and he is the best, most perfect, and wisest mind, uncompounded, without beginning, [84] and without end. He is in the world and above the world. He is not in any place, and he is in all places. These are the properties of God, through which he is separated from his creations and other things that are like unto them.

[This] was translated into the Turko-Arabic language by Ahmet, Kaddi of Berroia, the father of Muhammad Çelebi the scribe.

Chapter 2: He is wise, good, true, and absolute truth. And as many advantages as his creations have separately, He alone holds the most sublime mode. And his creations also possess these perfections because He gave them to his creations. [These] are the good things: because He is wise, they are wise; because He is true, they are true. And likewise with the others. Except that God possesses these things masterfully, while his creations partake in them.

Chapter 3: We believe that there are three other properties in God which are like the origins and sources of all his other properties. Through these three properties God lives [85] eternally in himself [as He did] before the world was created by him. He created the world through these and through them he governs it. And we call these three properties three *hypostases*, or rather three persons. And because these properties do not divide the one and most basic essence of God, God with these properties is one God, and not three Gods, as some dare to say.

Chapter 4: We believe that the Word and the Spirit arise out of the nature of God, like light and heat from a fire. And just as with fire, even if something is not being illuminated and heated by it, nevertheless fire always has light and heat and sends forth light and heat to us. In the same way the Word and Spirit existed before the world was created. [They are] the physical energies of God, since God is the Mind, as was stated before. And these three, Mind, Word, and Spirit, are one God, just as in one human soul there are the mind, the reason²⁵¹ of the mind, and the will of the mind, and these three are one soul with respect to [their] substance. Again, we call the Word of God the wisdom and power of God, and also His Son, because He is a product of His nature, just as we call the product of the nature of man [86] the son of man, and just as the thought of man is the product of his soul. Again, we call the will of God the Spirit and love of God. We call the mind itself the Father, because it is un-generated and without-cause, the cause of the Son and the Spirit. And so God does not only conceive of his creations, but moreover He conceives and discerns Himself, and on account of this He possesses reason and wisdom, through which he conceives Himself. Likewise God does not care for and love only his own creations, but he cares for and loves himself more by far. For this reason His Word and Spirit advance from God eternally, and they are in Him eternally. And these two with God are one God.

²⁵¹ Please note that the Greek word *logos* (λόγος) means both “word” and “reason.”

Chapter 5: We believe that God through the Word of his wisdom and power made the world, and through the spirit of his good will and love He provides for, governs, and moves all of his nature in the world towards good according to the class of each nature. On account of this we believe that God, when he willed it, turned humans away from the error of the demons and from idolatry out of sheer mercy. Except for the small district of the Jews, in which one God was worshiped and believed in according to the Law of Moses, all of the rest [87] of the world venerated the creations of God, and they worshiped many gods which were not equal to the one and only true God. They governed [themselves] according to the private yearnings of each, not according to the law of God.

Chapter 6: Then God renewed men through his Word and through his Holy Spirit. For the Word of God was endowed with human nature, so that, as a man, He might consort with men, and as the Word of God and God's wisdom, he might teach men to believe in the one true God and to govern themselves according to the law which he gave them. Yet again, as man, that He might give his way of life [as] a paradigm of his teaching, for first He observed the law which He gave to humans. And as the Word and power of God, that he might be able to set right the good of the world, which he wished for, as it was impossible to turn the world to God by the power of one man. Thus through His Word the almighty and invisible God sowed the truth in Jerusalem, and through his Spirit He enlightened and strengthened His apostles, so that they themselves might sow the truth over all the world for the sake of their love of the Spirit of God and of the savior [88] of the world, according to the example of Jesus, who voluntarily died a human [death] in order that the world be saved. Thus we believe in one God in three, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, just as our messiah Jesus Christ taught. And because He is true, we believe that He is also truth itself. His disciples taught us broadly in this way, and we also think in this way because of the power of wisdom.

Chapter 7: We believe that the Word of God and the man, in whom the Word of God was clothed, is the messiah. The life of Christ in his flesh was the life of a supremely holy man. The power of his wisdom and of his works was the power of God.

Chapter 8: We believe that just as the soul and body of one man become one man, thus the Word of God on the one hand, and the soul and body on the other, are always two natures, divided perfectly in one human. Thus the human and the divine are in one messiah divided perfectly by nature, [but] only by *hypostasis* united in respect of

persons. Neither is the Word of God [89] changed into the flesh or the soul of Christ, nor is the flesh of Christ or his soul converted into the Word of God, but it was and is in Christ. After his miraculous dispensation, the Word of God is Word, humanity is humanity. And [we believe] that the humanity of Christ did not assume divinity, but the divinity of the Word of God did assume human nature. In him it was assumed. Everything that is in God and from God physically is God, because there is no accident in God. For this reason we call that the spiritual Word of God, God, and we believe [that it is God]. Because this Word of God was in Christ, we confess that Christ was God and man; man on account of the soul and body, God on account of the Word of God in Him.

Chapter 9: We believe that the Word of God was in Christ and in the world and in heaven and in God and Father because the Word of God is infinite, just as God is infinite, He who begets Him, or rather contemplates Him, having infinite power. Nevertheless, it was in God in one way, in Christ in another, and in the world in another.

Chapter 10: We believe that when God shares His goodness [90] and grace with creation, He in no way suffers, but rather He is exalted, because the sublimity of God is made manifest by the excellence of his creations. And by as much as creation improves through more participation in His goodness, by that much more does the goodness and power of God show itself. For this reason the goodness, power, and love of God for humans was more exalted by the coming of the Word of God and of God, with all of His power, into Jesus, or by how he sent into the prophets one of His graces or two, into one prophet less, [and] into another more.

Chapter 11: We believe that Christ was crucified and died of his own will, for many great benefits [which] need many words [to explain], and all these things by his human [nature]. For the Word of God was neither crucified nor did it die nor did it rise, but rather it raised the dead, just as it also raised the flesh which it carried. We believe that the risen Christ was taken up to the heavens and that he will come again in glory to judge the world.

Chapter 12: We believe that the souls of men are immortal, that the bodies of the saints will be resurrected uncorrupted, [91] shining, and buoyant, neither needing food nor drink nor clothes nor any other bodily pleasure. And that the souls and the bodies of those who lived well will depart for paradise. The [souls and bodies of those] who did not repent of their wiles and lack of faith, on the other hand, [will go to] hell. The

paradise and pleasure of the saints is in heaven, while the punishment of the wicked is in the earth. The pleasure of the saints is nothing other than their souls being perfected in knowledge. Then they will behold the mysteries of God which they do not now discern, unless through faith in Jesus Christ.

Chapter 13: There are many necessities and many reasons [that explain] why it was necessary for the Word of God to and for God to become flesh. When necessary, we are ready to provide them. In addition to these reasons, these seven [points] fulfill for us the truth of our faith:

Chapter 14: That the prophets of the Jews, who we also accept, predicted Jesus, all the things that he did, all the things that were done to him, and all the things that his disciples later did by his power. Likewise the oracles of the Greeks prophesized the forgiveness of God, as did the astronomers of the Persians and the Greeks, and [they predicted] all these things with great praise [92] of Jesus. And we have shown that all these prophecies were unalienable.

Chapter 15: That all the writings of our faith are in agreement with regards to all things, because their authors had one teacher, the grace of God. For otherwise they would have disagreed about something.

Chapter 16: That men everywhere revealed this faith with eagerness and [endured] many dangers, as it was new and paradoxical. Not only the ignorant and unlearned, but also the sensible and wise. On account of this the wandering of the demons was finally brought to an end.

Chapter 17: That this faith not embrace the impossible or the discordant, nor anything physical, but rather [that it embrace] all that is spiritual. It is the path leading the souls of men to the good of God and of the epoch of life to come.

Chapter 18: That whoever received this faith and lived virtuously according to the law of Jesus, they received great gifts from God, and they performed many miracles in the [93] name of Jesus, who would not have existed if this faith were contrary to the truth.

Chapter 19: That whatever some people say against this faith, we are able to unravel easily and rationally.

Chapter 20: That the emperors and their procurators once waged war of vengeance and murder on this faith in the *oikoumene* for 318 years, as they were polytheists and idolaters. They did not prevail, but rather the faith was victorious. It remains up to now, and the Lord will find it when He comes. If this faith did not

originate from the will of God, then it would have quickly perished. Glory to Him our Lord Jesus Christ, amen.

When the sultan heard these [words] of the patriarch, which he gave to him in written form, he marveled greatly at his teaching and his wisdom. He was assured of the complete truth concerning the faith of the Christians, that it is true and that the mysteries of their faith are true and miracle-working, and that there is not any guile in them. Rather they are pure and more brilliant [94] than gold. He loved very much the Christian people, and he looked up on them benevolently. And he gave an order and made great threats to those who would harass or slander any of the Christians, that they would be punished heavily. And not only the sultan loved the Christians, but also all of the Muslims on account of the decree of the *efendi*. The sultan was very glad and joyous to be the sovereign and emperor over such a people.

The patriarch, lord Gennadios, sat on the lofty patriarchal throne of the most holy great church of Christ for five years and [some] months. Because of the many great scandals which came about, he called the synod of high priests and clerics and noblemen of all the Christians, and he abdicated from the patriarchal throne. The high priests, clerics, and all the people beseeched him to remain, but he did not want to listen at all. He wrote his abdication in the record book of the great church, and taking his things, whatever he may have had, he then went to the Monastery of the Divine Prodromos on Mount Menoikeos, near to Serras. There he died peacefully and exchanged this world for the heavenly kingdom of God.

[95] When the synod convened there in the most holy great church of God in order to select another Patriarch, they chose unanimously.

Isidoron: Holy Monk and Spiritual [Father]

This man was the spiritual [father] of the whole city. Because of his merit, by the vote of the high priests of the clerics and of all the people, the Herakleian, with the other high priests, ordained him patriarch according to law. He received all lordship over the patriarchate. As long as he was patriarch, [things] passed peacefully and without scandal. All of the Christians were delighted with him because of the divine gifts which

he possessed, [as he was] holy, guileless, pure, distinguished from the sinners like a divine apostle. Nevertheless, as a human, he too paid the common debt, death, and he returned his soul into the hands of God.

Ioasaf: The Holy Monk Called Kousas

After the death of Patriarch Isidoron they elected him patriarch. After giving him the [96] small summons and the great one, the Herakleian ordained him. And when he was ordained, he sat on the lofty patriarchal throne, and he spent some time [on it]. He was a peaceful man, and he did not love scandal. Consequently the clerics did not shrink from partaking in scandals or in scandalizing him. And he tired of their scandals so much that he could not bear them [any longer]. He went and fell into a well in order to drown. And when he fell in, some Christians saw, ran over, and pulled him out of the well. He was scarcely speaking because he came just short of drowning. He spent many days sick from his crash in the well and from the quantity of water which filled his belly. The doctors burdened him with many purges and with other remedies, and [thus] they cured him. He did not fall into condemnation for willingly receiving death and falling short of the glory of God, obtaining as his due eternal flames.

Nevertheless the sultan cast him out from the city and banished him. And hear the reason: When the sultan took Trabzon, the emperor of the place, named David Komnenos, made obeisance before him. There was a *protovestiarios* of [97] his kingdom, from among the first [men] of that place, Trabzon, and he was the grandson of Iagari, the son of [Iagari's] daughter. Likewise Mahmut Pasha [descended from] the other daughter of Iagari, who was in Serbia. Thus the *protovestiarios* was the first cousin of the pasha, [as they were the] sons of two sisters. He could speak freely with the sultan in the name of the pasha, his cousin. This *protovestiarios* had a lawful wife and children with her. Earlier the sultan had gone and waged war on Athens and took it. Then there were 6964 years from the creation of the world. He executed the lord of Athens there, and he brought his wife and children here to Constantinople. She was the daughter of Lord Dimitrios of Asa, lord of Corinth, and she had a very beautiful face and body. Her beauty was heard of all over the city. When the *protovestiarios* heard

about her he wanted to see her. As he had freedom of speech with the sultan, he devised many wiles and saw her. And when he beheld her beauty, he fell entirely in love with her and longed for her, and he decided to himself that he would either marry her or die. Then he sent letters and messages, as if they were from [98] the pasha to the patriarch, so that he might grant his permission for marriage. The patriarch, however, did not want to hear or to accept such talk, as it was clearly an adulterous union that transgressed divine laws. Moreover, his lawful wife and children were crying out [in protest]. When the pasha saw that the patriarch and the great sacristan did not grant permission, he made the sultan cut off the beard of the patriarch and sever the great sacristan's nose on both sides. Then the pasha withdrew the patriarch from the patriarchal throne, with an order from the sultan, and he chased him off. Then, at the time when they were cutting the patriarch's beard, he said in a loud voice, "Not only my beard should they cut for the sake of the truth and because I do not transgress the laws and become scandalized, but [let them] also [cut] my hands, feet, and head." In this way was he chased off the patriarchal throne.

This was the reason for the great sacristan, whose nose they slit: He was very wise, law-abiding, and just, and he was never willing to speak or to act outside of the [limits] which the divine laws delineated. On account of this the patriarch, knowing that he was just, always kept him beside him and consulted him. For this reason [99] the *protovestiarios* secretly informed him and sent many gifts to him in order to turn him and to make the patriarch accept and assent to his marrying the adulteress. But the blessed sacristan both sent the gifts back and angrily chased away those who had brought them. He told them that we do not depart from the decree of the divine laws, but rather we hold fast to them and we defend [them] so that they be unshaken and unchanged forever. And whoever side-steps and tramples them, he will fall upon the anger and curse of God and will be chastised eternally. In this way the men sent by the *protovestiarios* went back, disgraced, and they told to him all of the words which the great sacristan had said. And when the *protovestiarios* heard these dreadful words of the great sacristan, he went to the pasha and told him, and he slandered him, [saying] that he is the reason why the patriarch did not assent. For this reason they severed his nose.

The *protovestiarios* fulfilled his love-yearning. He received permission from the pasha and married her illegally. He committed adultery with her and utterly drove off his legal wife and children. [100] But the divine blade of God did not let him go far

without repaying his debt, as he did. He gave it swiftly. For one day the *protovestiarios* was sitting with some nobles, and they were playing dice, that is to say, backgammon (*tavla*). And while playing, he extended [his hand] to take the dice to throw them. And just as he extended his hand, there, at that moment, he died, gnashing his teeth fiercely and terribly. O Your forbearance, Lord. You are great and formidable, Lord. Who will withstand your righteous anger? Holy David says, “God, Lord of vengeance,” and so on. And the Holy Writ says, “For God has an avenging eye,” that is to say, God has avenging eyes which punish.

And of those who were sitting there playing [dice with] the *protovestiarios*, and others who were there, no one saw how his death arrived. But when they saw him [die], they were frightened and terrified, and they prayed to God with their whole souls, in order that He might spare them from such dreadful anger. For his death came unseen, and just as Julian the Apostate was slain and deprived on account of his desire of both the present and future world, he got to enjoy the eternal flames with the lawless enemies of the truth and of God.

[101] When the sultan and pasha heard about the sudden and dreadful death of the *protovestiarios*, they marveled at it, and they knew that it was a punishment from God, and they were distressed. Nevertheless, when the pasha, with a sultanic order commanded, and the patriarch departed from the throne and was completely driven off, many high priests came together and joined with the clerics of the great church, and they formed a synod, in order to appoint and to establish a patriarch. Thus they unanimously elected Xilokaravis the patriarch.

Markos, the Holy Monk Xilokaravis

After this man was elected patriarch and received the small and great summonses, they ordained him as patriarch, and he received the church of Christ to shepherd it. He was from Constantinople, and he was a very erudite man. He [reigned] for a short time on the patriarchal throne. Many scandals sprang forth and came to light against this patriarch from the clerics, since no one loved him.

These four above-mentioned patriarchs, Scholarios, Isidoros, Ioasaf, and Xilokaravis did not give the sultan any gifts. They were the only ones [for whom], as in the time of the empire of the Romans, the emperor was bestowing gifts upon the patriarch, as we have written above according to name. It was in this time [that] a holy monk named Simeon, from Trabzon, came here to Constantinople and settled in the great church. He was resourceful and very hospitable. There was no one as hospitable as him. The people of Trabzon decided to make him patriarch and to remove the legal patriarch, Lord Markos. They had sons in the *saray* of the sultan and outside in his *Porte*, with high positions, and they had freedom of speech among them. For their sake, their word carried a lot of weight with the sultan. Nevertheless, the people of Trabzon made preparations and did this. They received the clerics and weighted them down with great gifts and flattery. They agreed with one another to speak this slander against the patriarch: how he set a bad precedent and custom for the church and gave a thousand *florins*, in order to give *peşkeş* [a gift offering] to the *Porte* of the sultan. [103] This [was done] not only to depose [him], but also, just as [with] heretical patriarchs of old, to anathematize and to banish him, because formerly the patriarchs had not given any gift to the *Porte* of the sultan. Neither Patriarch Xilokaravis had given, nor had the other patriarchs who had come before him, from the time that the sultan took Constantinople, as we have written. And after this unjust slander, which they said of the patriarch, they wanted to dethrone and drive him away, describing how he had made this evil increase. And the patriarch, when he heard this, that he had given the *peşkeş*, a thousand *florins*, to the *Porte* of the sultan [to] become patriarch, he wanted to die, and he swore terrible and frightening oaths on the divine and holy Gospel, with stole and pallium, that he did not know about this at all, nor did want it ever to seem as if he gave the *peşkeş*. But his enemies, the slanderers, and others with them would not believe him. They confirmed that **yes**, truly, he had set a bad precedence in the church, and that he had given the *peşkeş*. And for this reason we should remove him from the patriarchal throne, for he is worthy of being deposed and driven away. And so the nobles of Trabzon and some of the other noble citizens gathered together, and they collected a thousand *florins*, [104] and they sent them to the sultan, saying that the patriarch fixed a thousand *florins* [as payment] for your majesty. Such we give, in order to make our own monk patriarch, because all of the people and clerics do not want this patriarch, Lord Markos. When the sultan heard these words he laughed, and he paused for a long time, contemplating the envy and ignorance of the Romans, and how they do

not walk [on the path of] God. Then he replied and said that in truth the patriarch fixed these thousand *florins*. The sultan said this in order to set a custom and precedent, so that the patriarchs, when they want to become [patriarch], give *peşkeş* to his kingdom. But the pitiable Patriarch, Lord Markos, had not said or fixed such a thing. Rather, as we have said, they slandered him into order to remove him from the throne. Nevertheless, the sultan, when he received the thousand *florins*, said, “Since no one wants him, remove him, and place he who you want.” Then they removed the patriarch, Lord Markos, by force and unjustly, from the patriarchal throne, and they drove him off.

Simeon the Holy Monk from Trabzon

After driving away Lord Markos the high priests clamored [105] and cast their votes for Lord Simeon of Trabzon. After voting, they gave the two summonses, the small and the great, and they performed the ordination. After he was ordained by the Herakleias, they mounted him upon the lofty patriarchal throne. As for the former patriarch, Lord Markos, the clerics and many of the people cursed him and threw rocks at him from the streets and the squares. They formed a pile with their stones, cursing him for having set an evil custom for the church. And he, as we have said, did not know anything about it; there was nothing the pitiable man could do. He just sat and waited patiently for the formation of a synod, that the great injustice wrought against him might be judged. And he did not even stop to write to the high priests concerning the matter and the slander [against] him.

After some time passed, many high priests convened, metropolitans and bishops, and a great synod formed in order to address some ecclesiastical matters. And so the former patriarch, Lord Markos, showed up there, shouting that his dismissal from the patriarchal throne had been unjust and unreasonable. Great confusion and scandal arose on account of this. There was there in the synod of high priests [a certain man from] Philippopolis, Lord Dionysios. He shared [106] much great spiritual affection with Lady Maria, the step-mother of the sultan. She honored and loved Lord Dionysios, as her spiritual father. Lady Maria also learned about the scandals of the patriarch, and she thought to herself and said I will make Lord Dionysios patriarch so that both leave.

After this the scandals will cease, as all of the people of Constantinople, religious and lay, were divided into two, one part wanting Lord Markos and the other Lord Symeon. There was great confusion and disorder in the great church and among the high priests and clerics. As for Lady Maria, since she wanted to make Lord Dionysios [patriarch], she accomplished the task. She put two thousand *florins* on a silver tray, and she took them and went and made obeisance before the sultan while holding them. When the sultan saw, he asked her what are these *florins* with the silver tray, O mother? She replied and said that I have my own monk, and I request your majesty to make him patriarch. The sultan took the *florins*, and he thanked his step-mother very much, she who made him this bounty. Then he said to her, “Do, my mother, whatever [107] you wish.” After the sultan sent an order, they deposed Lord Simeon from the throne and from the patriarchal honor and rank.

Dionysios Metropolitan of Philippopolis

And so after Lord Simeon was driven away, they elected Lord Dionysios patriarch, and they gave him the small summons, then [later] the great one after the vespers. They placed him on the great most lofty patriarch throne, and Lord Simeon was not able to do anything, since the sultan ordered this. The saying became [realized, that] “of those who fight, the third [will be] first.” That is, according to the common saying, when two [people] are fighting, get tired, and withdraw from the fight, [and] another third person comes against them, he becomes first, as he finds the two exhausted from the fight and unable to fight with him. Thus it happened to the above-mentioned patriarchs. Lord Simeon departed and went to the Monastery of Stenimachos, while Lord Markos received the position of archbishop of Achridon from the synod. He reigned as archbishop there a little while, [then] he died.

Lord Dionysios, the patriarch, served as patriarch for eight years. [108] He was from the Peloponnesus, that is to say, from the Morea, and he came here to Constantinople as a little child. He was in the Monastery of Magganon, and he became the subordinate of Lord Markos of Eugenikos, I mean, of Ephesus. This man raised him. He taught him the Holy Scriptures, and he also taught him the monastic way of

life. He ordained him deacon and priest, and he was with him his whole life, the old man from Ephesus. And when the sultan waged war on Constantinople and seized it, then Lord Dionysios was present here, and they took him prisoner with many other Christians, men, women, and children. A noble named Kyritzis purchased him, Lord Dionysios, in Adrianopolis, and he emancipated him. On account of the great virtue which he possessed, Lord Dionysios became Metropolitan of Philippopolis after being ordained by Patriarch Scholarios. Then he also became patriarch. And when he was on the patriarchal throne, the enemy and opponent of the Christians, I mean the devil, begrudged the peace and the stability which the Church of Christ possessed. He cast forth and sowed tares and scandals among the clerics, and they slandered the patriarch [by saying that he] had been circumcised **[109]** by the Turks and [that] they had cut him when they made him a slave here in Constantinople. A great synod of high priests, metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops was assembled concerning this accusation. They convened in the holy tribunal, with the most honored clerics of the great church assembling as well as the very high-born nobles and the whole multitude of common people. When the Holy Synod convened, the accusers of the patriarch came forward, some of whom were clerics, and they were saying and shouting that yes, truly, he had been circumcised by the Turks. The patriarch swore with terrible oaths that all the things they said were untrue. It was just injustice and slander. But they were not satisfied by his oaths. They just shouted all the more that he had been circumcised. When the synod heard these things it was astonished; some of them believed this and others did not. The patriarch, beholding his accusers and enemies, who wanted to dominate him with lies, could not do anything to reveal the truth about how they lied. [But] under force of necessity, even the law can be amended. And so he got up and stood upright right in the middle of the crowd of people, and he lifted the ends of his clothes, which he was wearing, and showed **[110]** his flesh to all of the people, from one part to the other, right and left, while the high priests, clerics, nobles, and all of the people were sitting. And when they saw his purity and virginity, they were all astounded and amazed, because there was no sign of flesh on it, that is to say, his member, except a little sliver of skin. Then the synod ran [to him] and kissed his feet. The accusers who made charges against him were very shamed, and they were reviled and reproached by the Christians. They fell at the feet of the patriarch so that he might forgive the injustice and slander which they had prepared. But he did not want to forgive them at all, and he did not even turn to look at them. He just stood boldly, and

he put on his stole and pallium. He excommunicated all of them who had worked together and prepared this slander [against him]. After this he signed his resignation. The high priests and all of the people were begging him to stay on the throne, but he did not want to listen [and] to stay on the throne at all. He just quickly left the city with all his [111] livelihood and with the other things which he possessed, and he went to the Monastery of *Acheiropoietos* of the Most Holy *Theotokos* of Kosinissa, which is near to Kavala. There he did penitence and many renovations and embellishments inside and outside [of the monastery]. He made it beautiful and restored it. He settled and lived peacefully and harmlessly, and the superior, elders, and monks honored him very much.

The divine and holy synod fell into great apprehension [regarding] whom they [should] make patriarch. Unanimously they summoned the former one.

Simeon of Trabzon Again

When they chose the former patriarch, Lord Simeon, for the second time, they took him and brought him to the great universal church, and they sat him on the lofty patriarchal throne. And he received again his throne. But when they made Lord Simeon patriarch, they went and gave the *peşkeş* to the Porte of the sultan, the first thousand *florins*, of which Lord Simeon had [set as] a terrible precedent. But the *defterdar* did not accept them. He just drove them off [112] having found in the royal account book the two thousand *florin peşkeş* which the afore-mentioned former patriarch, Lord Dionysios, had given. The patriarch, high priests, and clerics, could not do anything, [so they] gave the two thousand *florins*, and thus the *defterdar* reconciled [with them].

This patriarch was on the throne for three years, and he passed them peacefully without any confusion or scandal. But the originator of scandals and the enemy of us Christians, the devil, begrudged this, and a monk by the name of Raphael, whose fatherland was Serbia, appeared on the scene. He had great friendship and freedom of speech at the Porte of the sultan, as the pashas loved him. And since he had freedom of speech with them, he went and made obeisance before them, and he spoke with them and agreed and consented that he give every year to the Porte of the sultan a *harac* of

two thousand *florins*. They made [it a rule that] the *peşkeş* be given every time there is a new patriarch. When the pashas heard this, they gladly received Raphael their friend, and they made a petition, that is, an *arzu*, for the sultan. When he heard this he rejoiced, and he issued an order. They deposed Lord Simeon from the patriarchal throne.

Raphael the Serbian Monk

Some of the high priests came to the great church with the royal decree in order to make Raphael patriarch, and when he came, they cast their votes and ordained him under compulsion. He was ordained by the Ankyran because the Herakleian learned of [what had happened] before the synod convened and became sick. Both the Kaisareian and the Ephesian happened not to come. When they ordained him, they raised him up to the patriarchal throne as patriarch. Some assumed the attitude that they would not minister together with him. But out of fear and under compulsion, they did minister together. He was a great lover of alcohol and food and every day, all the days of the year, he spent them the same way, [spending] night as day, and he would never hear the hours, vespers, or orthos. And whenever someone wanted to seek him out regarding a spiritual need or crisis, he was never fasting, just drunk. And if you can believe it, on the awesome day of Good Friday, at the vigil for the holy passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, he was drunk. He stood on the throne, [but] because of intoxication, [114] he [could not even] stand. The staff kept falling from his hand, and they would pick it up, wake him up, and give it to him. Everyone hated him, religious and lay, on the one hand because of his daily intoxication, and on the other hand because of his language, as he did not understand Greek, only Serbian, because as we have said, he was from Serbia and spoke Serbian. He could not understand Greek at all, but he had an interpreter (*dragoman*) who spoke.

When he received the patriarchal throne, he prepared two thousand *florins* to give every year as a *harac*. And when the end of the year came to give it, the pashas called him into the *divan*, and they asked him for the *harac*, as he had promised to give it. He did not have the *harac*, nor did he have any helper to assist him, neither from the clerics nor from the nobles nor from the people. When the pashas saw that he fooled them,

they threw him in prison. And so a few days went by, and he requested from the pashas that they give him permission to leave the prison to walk [in search of] alms from the Christians, to collect some of the original debt. And so they commanded, and they placed a heavy iron chain on him instead of a stole and pallium. They also gave him a Turk [who] dragged him [115] and guarded him. He walked around with a chain and begged, and whatever he gathered, he ate and drank. The miserable [man] died badly.

After his death the great synod of metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops; clerical superiors of archimandrites; and, [to put it] simply, other priests, nobles, good men, and the common people convened. They deliberated regarding whom they should make patriarch. They had great difficulty in finding a worthy man who would take the church of Christ to shepherd it rightly and justly.

Maximos the Learned and Very Wise

By the wisdom of God, with common opinion, they elected Maximos, well-versed in theology, whose name was Manuel and who was a great *ecclesiarch* of this great church of Constantinople. They had severed his nose by order of the sultan because the law was not trampled, as we wrote before, for the sake of the *protovestiaros* from Trabzon, who sought to marry the adulteress and did so. They made the great *ecclesiarch* a monk and they changed his name [116] to Maximos. They gave him the small message and the great one after the vespers. On the following day when the liturgy took place, all of the people, religious and lay, came together. The Herakleian ordained him patriarch in the *Pammakaristos*, there being great confidence and good order. After receiving him they placed him on the lofty patriarchal throne and gave the staff into his hand while the choir was chanting, as is the custom, songs for the Lord and chief priest. In this way he blessed the people of the Lord. After these things the high priests and the clerics and nobles took him with the 500 *florin peşkeş*, and they departed. He kissed the hand of the sultan and gave the *florins* to the Porte. And at the end of every year they gave the 2000 florins in *harac*.

While Lord Maximos the Learned reigned as patriarch, all affairs of the Church passed peacefully and without scandal, as scandals were uprooted from their midst and

divine love remained. For he shepherded his flock in the teachings and admonitions of the Lord. He did not pause each Sunday and on the Feast days of the Lord and his Mother from teaching on the pulpit the people of Christ, as he was most learned and sweet in his words [117] when he taught and spoke. He had a remarkable tongue, and he unfolded his words with many lovely examples from Holy Writ, which deeply moved every human soul. No other wise man of that time matched him in grace.

So great was he in theology that his name and fame were heard of by the sultan. Then he sent for him to write an explanation of the holy formula of our faith, that is to say, "I believe in one God, Father almighty." So the patriarch made an explanation, and he wrote it theologically and skillfully, as he was very wise, and he sent it to the sultan. When [the sultan] received it, he was delighted, when he heard his explanation.

And there were at that time, in the *saray* of the sultan, noble and well-learned [men] from Trabazon. One of them was the son of Amiroutzi, Mehmet Bey, most learned and wise in Greek and Arabic learning. He was so wise that he translated our own Christian books into the Arabic language by order of the sultan. For the sultan never ceased from questioning the son of Amiroutzi, as a wise man, and other wise men whom [118] he had in his *saray*, about the faith of us Christians. They explained these things in great detail, and he took great pleasure in listening to these things. Among all those things, they said that whoever the high priests and priests of the Christians excommunicate legally for the offences which they committed, and who do not [manage] while they are alive to make right and to worship for the error for which they were excommunicated, the earth does not dissolve the body of that excommunicate, but they stay like [the skin of] drums. And if a thousand years pass, the earth would not consume them. They just remain intact, just as they buried them. And he asked them if it is possible for them to be forgiven, [and] to release their bodies again. They replied and said that it is possible. When he heard this astounding mystery, he shuddered and marveled and did not ask any more questions. But then he charged the patriarch with finding an excommunicate who has been dead for a long time. When the patriarch heard the message of the sultan he was astounded, and then he cried out at the clerics and told them the message of the sultan. They were amazed. The patriarch and clerics entered a great state of anxiety concerning where such an old excommunicate could be found. They did not know what to do for the time being. [Thus] they sought from the sultan a fixed time of a few days. [119] When they received the time allotment they considered where such an excommunicate could be found. Some elders from among

the clerics recalled that in the days of the former patriarch, Lord Gennadios Scholarios, there was a very beautiful widowed priest's wife, and she had a lodging outside of the patriarchate. She settled and prostituted herself there openly. When the patriarch learned this, he admonished her many times, that she desist from her sin, repent, and be forgiven. She, however, ran further into her debauchery. The patriarch did not desist from censuring and reproaching her, alone and in the open, before high priests and clerics. This wretched woman, deceived by the devil, made an accusation against the patriarch, [claiming] that when he called her to speak in secret, he wanted to overpower her, so that he might sin with her. When he heard this fearful word of unjust accusation, he was amazed. [News] of the accusation against the patriarch was heard all over Constantinople and in all of the places nearby. Some believed it, while others did not. The patriarch did not have anything else he could do. On one Lord's feast he called the high priests and clerics, and he performed the liturgy. After the liturgy he announced and said that with regards to the words which the priest's wife said against him, if [120] she spoke justly, she shall be forgiven and blessed by God, and after death her body will dissolve. If, on the other hand, she slandered him unjustly in the accusation which she made, she will be excommunicated, un-forgiven, and not dissolved by God almighty. O wondrous event! In forty days the divine sword of God smote her, from dysentery, and she died badly. They buried her, and the earth did not dissolve her. She just remained un-dissolved and intact, just as they buried her. Not even any of the hairs on her head fell out. They just remained as [they are] on living women, but she did not speak. Years past, during which the poor woman was under the condemnation of excommunication. And the clerics remembered how this woman was certainly excommunicated, knowing that she unjustly accused the patriarch, the late Lord Gennadios. They mentioned this matter freely before the synod, that they knew a woman, and she was righteously excommunicated by the former patriarch Lord Gennadios. When the patriarch heard this, that an excommunicate was discovered, he said that her grave should be found, where she was buried, in order that they might open it, see, and be persuaded further. And so they learned about her grave, where she was buried. When the patriarch heard this he rejoiced, and he immediately ran with the clerics [121] and great *çavuş* of the sultan, and they opened her grave and found her sound and intact. She was tanned and swollen like a drum. Everyone who saw her cried for her greatly, beholding the awesome condemnation and judgment, which held her pitiable body. When she was found the patriarch immediately informed, through the

sergeant, the people who had come and told him, on behalf of the sultan, to find an excommunicate. [He said that] an excommunicate had been found and asked the sultan what he orders. When they heard this wondrous [news] they ran and announced the matter to the sultan, and when he learned of it, he dispatched loyal servants. They beheld her and marveled greatly. And when they returned and went to the sultan, they explained the awesome thing which they had seen. Then the sultan called some of his nobles, and he gave them his seal, so that they might put the corpse somewhere, close it, and seal it. Thus the nobles went and beheld the corpse with pity, and they were amazed. Then they placed it in a [part] of the Chapel of the *Pammakaraistou*, and they sealed it on the casket with the royal seal. Then they asked the patriarch what would happen to the corpse and what reply they had for the sultan, that is to say, when would the body be dissolved and [122] and forgiven. The patriarch told them that I [will] chant to it the rites we have concerning excommunicates, and we will also say prayers every day. When we complete the rites and the prayers, we will perform a liturgy of forgiveness for her. Then, we will notify you to come to take the corpse out. After a few days the patriarch wrote her forgiveness writ, and thus he informed those nobles to come and to take the corpse and casket from the chapel for the liturgy. Then they went at the behest of the sultan and removed the corpse, just as it had been enclosed, sealed in the casket. The liturgy [was performed] with great confidence. The high priests, deacons, and all of the Christian people convened, and the after the end of the liturgy the patriarch stood with compunction and many tears. He read her forgiveness writ, which the patriarch had written with his own hand. O great wonders of God! O compassion and love of men, great and frightful wonder, which took place at that moment. Just as the patriarch read the forgiveness [writ], the joints of the body started separating and disintegrating in the [123] casket. Everyone near the casket was listening to the crackle while bone was separating from bone. The entire body disintegrated and all the joints separated and that wretched body, which had accused unjustly the holy patriarch, was forgiven. Not only her body was forgiven and released, but her soul was also freed from punishment and received in paradise, because these were also excommunicated, just like their indissoluble and intact bodies. These were in need of forgiveness in order to be set free from the bonds of excommunication, because just as the body was found bound and un-dissolved in the earth, in the same way the soul was bound and chastised in the hands of Satan. When the body receives forgiveness and is released from excommunication, by the power of God the soul is

freed from the hands of the devil and receives eternal life and the never-setting light. Those who stood near the casket, in which the excommunicate was, when they heard this awesome wonder, that the bones crackled and separated one from the other, they marveled greatly. They thanked God, the maker of extraordinary and great wonders, with tears. Then when the liturgy was finished, they lifted up the casket with the corpse, and they cast it there [124] where first she had been, in the chapel, just as the nobles ordered, whom the sultan had sent to her. And when they set it inside, they closed the door and locked it, and they sealed its top with the seal of the sultan on account of the mass of the people who could not be counted. After [some] days they opened the outer seal of the chapel and the other seal of the casket and the lock with the key, and they found the body in the casket disintegrated and separated and forgiven. When they saw it, they were amazed at this awesome wonder. Immediately the nobles ran to the sultan and told him from beginning to end the narrative of the corpse, about the reason she was excommunicated, how she was forgiven, and how bone separated from bone. When the sultan heard this, he wondered greatly and was surprised at this marvel, and he said that truly the faith of the Christians is true. From then on he loved all the more Mehmet Bey, the son of Amiroutzi, who spoke of this matter [which] appeared true, that he who the high priests and priests of the Romans justly excommunicate, the earth does not dissolve them if they do not receive forgiveness, even if thousands of years should pass.

This sultan physically went to Athens and waged war against it 6964 years after the creation of the world. He waged war against it and took it by the sword, and he executed its lord. [125] He brought to the City the wife of this lord and many others, with male and female children. He brought them to his *saray*.

In the 6978th year, in the month of July, on the 19th, he formed a great armada and many troops by land, and he went to the Eurippus and waged war against it. Since they were not willing to make obeisance before him, he executed all of the male population twelve years old or older. He took the children, male and female, with their mothers and brought them to the city. He turned the church of the Franks into an *ismagidion*. The Venetians administered the Eurippus.

This sultan sent Ahmet Paşa to Apulia with mighty and gallant troop, and he went and passed to Apulia. He waged war on Otranto and other castles and lands, and he reduced all of Apulia. That is to say, he took many captives, men, women, and children. He waited there for reinforcements to come from the sultan so that he might

exterminate and finally to annihilate [Apulia]. Wherever the sultan went to make war, no one resisted him. Every just made obeisance before him, in both East and West.

The sultan gathered troops, three hundred [126] thousand, and he formed an armada with two hundred and fifty galleys and *fustas*, and he rigged them well. He passed with his troops to the east, and he went to Syria to wage war on the sultan of Cairo. When he went near to Nikomedia he became sick and died, 6988 years after the creation of the world. The pasha who was at Puglia became fearful. He immediately made ships for transferring cavalry and passed with all of the troops and captives which he had to Aulona and from there to Constantinople.

The end of the reign of Sultan Mehmet, who took the City.

After the death of the sultan his son, Sultan Bayezid received the kingdom. At that time the patriarch was the above-mentioned Lord Maximos the learned. Sultan Mehmet had reigned for thirty-two years, and these are the patriarchs of his reign, whose names we have written:

Gennadios Scholarios the Wise

Isidoros the Spiritual

Ioasaf Kousas, whose beard was cut [by order of] the sultan

Markos Xilokaravis

[127] Simeon of Trabzon, who first cast the *peşkeş* upon the Church

Dionysios Metropolitan of Philippopolis

Simeon of Trabzon again

Raphael the Serb, who first paid the *harac*

Maximos the learned, during whose patriarchate, as we said above, the sultan died

This patriarch, Lord Maximos, after reigning six years departed for the Lord and the heavenly abode. After hearing about the death of the patriarch, all the high priests of the West and of the East ran swiftly and gathered in the mother of churches, the universal great church. There was at that time a very useful high priest of Ephesus, Lord Daniel, who was very learned. There were also many other very learned high priests, among whom one was Lord Niphon of Thessaloniki. When the high priests gathered, a synod formed to choose the patriarch. They cast their votes and chose the man from Thessaloniki.

Niphon, Metropolitan of Thessaloniki

After the election of Lord Niphon [to become] patriarch they gave him the small message and the large one after the vespers. The *Herakleian* put the staff in his hands, and he ascended the most lofty patriarchal throne and blessed both the religious and the lay. This patriarch was very useful, and he taught every day on the pulpit. He did not just speak for the sake of speaking, but rather he had a breadth of language and great thoughts that were better than [those] of the philosophers who [lived] at that time. His fatherland was the Peloponnesus, that is to say, the Morea. His mother was a very noble Roman woman, and his father was an Albanian noble. From a young age he loved and yearned for the monastic way of life, and he left his parents and went to the Holy Mountain to the Monastery of the *Pantokrator*. He became a monk, then also a priest. He spent many years there at the Monastery of the *Pantokrator*. When the Metropolitan of Thessaloniki died, the throne remained vacant of high priest and shepherd. And so when the bishops of Thessaloniki gathered, they all went to the cathedral. A synod formed with clerics and other religious and with [129] nobles and all of the people. They elected Lord Niphon, and they sent honorable men and clerics to the Holy Mountain. They sought him as their high priest, as his fame was spoken of everywhere. But Lord Niphon did not want to listen or to depart from the monastery to become high priest. The holy fathers of the monastery went to him, and they beseeched and implored him, saying that it is for the benefit of the people. Since there is a need for a worthy shepherd, do not ignore us, but go with our prayers and take the throne so that you might shepherd the people of the Lord who bear Christ's name. And the most holy Lord Niphon, lacking anything else to say, so that he not appear disobedient to the holy fathers, made obeisance before the fathers and his brothers at the holy monastery. He went with the people of Thessaloniki and was ordained Metropolitan of Thessaloniki in the great church. Later he became Patriarch of Constantinople. In this way virtue exalts those who love her.

The former patriarch, Lord Symeon of Trabzon, died and left countless possessions. He had not made any provision while living for his possessions, whether

they [130] go to the church or be given to a monastery or to other places, wherever seemed fit. But he died without setting things right. When Lord Niphon became patriarch, he did not receive and honor the son of Amiroutzi, the son of Skanderbeg, who was at that time the *hazinedar paşa* and neighbor of the patriarchate. Amiroutzi took great offence [because] the patriarch slighted him and did not even receive him. He kept poison inside his belly, reserved for the patriarch, and sought to find the opportune time to vomit it, just as he did. Then Amiroutzi knew that when the patriarch, Lord Simeon, died, he did not have an heir, and he confiscated all of those possessions and other instruments of the church, because he said that whoever dedicated holy instruments and other things in the days of the patriarch, upon his death all these things are confiscated. And so Amiroutzi took ornate Gospels, silver censers, embellished icons, diverse holy coverings, silver staffs and many other instruments. The total value of these things of the church was one thousand one hundred and eighty *aspers*. He threw all of the clerics in jail, and there was a great persecution in the patriarchate. The patriarch, not having anything [he could do] about this, consulted with some of the nobles, [131] and he obtained witnesses to testify that his royal [highness] was the cousin of the deceased patriarch, the son of his sister. They went and testified just as the patriarch had instructed. Amiroutzi knew well that they testified lies, [that] it was not as they said, he being from Trabzon. He understood the matter: his royal [highness] was the grand nephew of the patriarch by a female cousin. Finding the [right] time, Amiroutzi vomited the venom, which he held in this belly, on the patriarch. He poisoned him and killed him. And he made a petition [concerning] this matter to the sultan. And when he heard this he became very angry and was infuriated with the patriarch. He removed him from the patriarchal throne and he drove him out from the city. For the three witnesses, he commanded that they chop off their noses. Of these three witnesses, one was a holy monk named Antonios.

The patriarchal throne stood without a patriarch for a long time. But the patriarch came secretly to the city, without the permission of the sultan, only with the word of the *defterdar*, in order to pay the *harac*. He fled secretly back again, so that no one might see him and hand him over to the sultan for decapitation.

[132] And the sultan, being very angry and enraged against this patriarch, called the clerics. He commanded them to appoint another patriarch and that no one should receive or accept the first one. If it should come to light that someone acted outside of the sultan's will, he would be hung. When they heard the fearful resolution of the

sultan, a synod formed of high priests, clerics, nobles, and all of the lay people, in order to make a patriarch. Being in a great state of anxiety, they remembered the former patriarch Lord Dionysios, who made his resignation and was found at Kosinitza on account of the unjust slander which they had said, that he had been circumcised, that is to say, cut. Thus they made a petition to the sultan, that they knew a worthy person [to be] patriarch. Then he gave the order, and they went and brought him under compulsion, as he did not want to come. He was very old.

Dionysios, the Former Patriarch

When Lord Dionysios came to the great church and received the patriarchal throne for the second time, the high priests and clerics and all of the priests, [133] nobles, and common people ran and made obeisance before him. They received prayers and blessings from him. There was great peace and concord in the great church of Christ. This patriarch was perfect in virtue and educated in the monastic [way of life]. There was no other like him. He was often fasting, and he was awake all night in prayer. When he wanted to go [conduct] some church business, he was not mounting [a horse]. He just went by foot, even though he was very old. There occurred in the time of his patriarchate many great and fearful earthquakes. He went from church to church, and he made processions and entreaties.

He [reigned] on the patriarchal throne for two years and [some] months, and [then] he made his resignation and went back to the monastery, which was that of Kosinitza, for repentance. And so since Lord Dionysios the patriarch resigned, a synod formed and they chose the Metropolitan of Serres, named Manassi, whom they renamed Maximos.

Maximos, Metropolitan of Serres

When they elected him, they cast their votes and [134] gave him, in due order, the small message, and after the vespers were chanted at vespers time, they also gave him the large one. And after he blessed the people of the Lord, bearing Christ's name and ascended the patriarchal throne, after the completion he went into his holy patriarchal cell. He was from the Holy Mountain. And when he became patriarch, a bad rumor circulated about him, and the Christians cursed him, religious and lay. Whether they were just or unjust when cursing him and making the accusations which they made, [only] he knew about these things, and he will be the one to give testimony on that day of fearful judgment.

Maximos reigned on the patriarchal throne for six years. There was great scandal [because of] a venerable monk named Gabriel. They removed the patriarch, Lord Maximos, from the patriarchal throne. A synod formed concerning whom they should make patriarch, and they unanimously invited this man:

Niphon, the Former Patriarch Again

After choosing this man as patriarch for the second time, they sent for him and brought him to the great church, and again he received the patriarchal throne from the holy synod of high priests, clerics, nobles, and all of the people of Christian-name. [135] He held the patriarchal throne for one year, and numerous great scandals occurred because of Maximos the former patriarch and because of the other high priests, metropolitans, and bishops, who did not want him, Lord Niphon. They deposed him for the second time from the patriarchal throne with great confusion and agitation and other bad things. When they deposed him from the patriarchal throne and drove him off, they formed a synod [to decide] whom they would make patriarch. They brought in many high priests. Finally they chose the [metropolitan of] Drama unanimously.

Ioakeim, Metropolitan of Drama

When they chose this man, they cast their votes in accordance with custom, and after he received the small message and the large one he sat upon the patriarchal throne. He was a young and uncultivated man. But he was very useful, virtuous, and humble. Everyone, religious and lay, loved him because he had these gifts. He wanted to go to Iberia²⁵² to give prayers and blessings to the lords of that place and to all of its people. He went, and the lords and nobles and all of the people received him with much [136] honor and reverence. They gave him many extraordinary gifts, seeing his humility, that he was an imitator of Christ, the great high priest. He went and saw all of the places in Iberia, [and then] he returned and went to Constantinople to his throne with a lot of possessions.

When he came, the high priests, clerics, and some laypeople were very jealous of him. One metropolitan from Silivri, whom they purged because of his evil deeds, which were apparent to everyone, did not only deserve to be outcast but also to be stoned. He got up, and he went to the *divan* of the sultan, and he set an extra thousand *florins* on the *harac*. Together this made three thousand. When the pashas heard this, they received him very kindly. And so right then they called up the patriarch, Lord Ioakeim, and they said: “If you consent to the extra one thousand *florins*, which the Metropolitan of Siliviri gave in order to become patriarch, then you can sit on the throne. But if you do not agree, depart, so that he might sit as patriarch. That is the decision and order of the sultan.” The patriarch, Lord Ioakeim, did not want to consent to this increase. He just decided to depart from the patriarchal throne, rather than [137] to fall into this sin. But the pious people, when they saw that the expunged and notorious metropolitan wanted to arbitrarily and illegally become patriarch, they went to the royal *divan* before the pashas and they consented to the thousand *florin* increase. In this way they harshly drove off the Silivrian, and Lord Ioakeim received again the patriarchal throne.

²⁵² Georgia.

But by the collusion of the devil something distressing happened to the Christians. One day Sultan Beyazid set out with on horseback with his court and went from place to place, hunting and making merry. Thus he passed by a place [called] *Chrysokeramos*, and he saw only one building with tiles. The others were without tiles, being laid only with slabs and other coverings. Only this one had tiles, and not a second one. When the sultan saw it, that it was distinct and alone, he asked the priests and the elders of the place “what is that lone building, which has tiles?” They answered from fear and said that it is a church of us Christians. The sultan asked them again, “Who gave you the authority to build it?” And they did not have anything bad in their minds, they just answered emptily and ignorantly, as unknowing [138] barbarians, and said that the patriarch gave us permission, and we built it. When the sultan heard this, the appearance of his face changed, and he became very angry. He was furious with the patriarch, and he wanted to give him a great and fearful punishment. But nevertheless he changed his mind, and he issued a fearful order to the clerics to depose the patriarch and to appoint another, so that he would not punish them and destroy them.

When the clerics saw the order and the resolution of the sultan, they were terrified, and at once they convened a synod with some high priests, who were present at the great church, and unanimously they elected for the third time the former patriarch, Lord Niphon, who was at *Blachia*. They disclosed [this] to him with some clerics of the great church, and they entreated him to come and to receive again the patriarchal throne. When he heard this, Lord Niphon did not want to accept it at all. He just sent the emissary clerics back as they had come and did not do any favors for them. When the clerics came to the great church they announced these things regarding Lord Niphon, that he did not accept this at all and did not want to hear [anything] about the patriarchate. Then the synod, when they heard these words, convened often, and discussing by name the most esteemed and [139] agreeable high priests, they did not agree on choosing a patriarch. In this way the synod was dissolved. When the synod convened again to appoint a patriarch, they chose unanimously the [Metropolitan of] Zichnon, who was not present then here in the great church but [who] was in his metropolis.

Pachomios Metropolitan of Zichon

After they elected with one mind this man as patriarch, they immediately sent for and brought him, and they gave him the small message and the large one. He received the staff from the Herakleian, after the Eucharist, as is the custom of patriarchs, as they say, and he sat on the patriarchal throne. The high priests and clerics and all of the Christians ran and made obeisance before him as patriarch.

This man was on the patriarchal throne for one year. Then some laypeople, friends of the former patriarch, Lord Ioakeim, agreed among themselves to give five hundred *florins* to the sultan, in order that he grant them back as patriarch Lord Ioakeim. The *harac* was three thousand *florins*, and they increased it by five-hundred, which made three thousand five-hundred. And this, which the friends of Lord Ioakeim ran and [140] made as an increase and apportioned [in] *florins* for the sultan, was [done] with the consent and will of Lord Ioakeim. He even gave the *florins* secretly but acted as if he did not know anything. When they made their request (*arzu*) to the sultan, that they give five-hundred *florins* to choose the patriarch, so that the first patriarch, Lord Ioakeim, comes back to the throne, [the sultan] prescribed it immediately, and they elected Lord Ioakeim.

Ioakeim Receives the Patriarchal Throne Again

After a short while had passed it was decided that he would go to Pougdanos²⁵³ for the second time. He prepared, took some clerics, and reached near there. Pougdanos knew about the increase, which the patriarch made, that he gave five hundred *florins* to depose the patriarch from his throne and for himself to sit upon it.

²⁵³ Pougdanos is a Greek version of the name Bogdania, a Medieval appellation for Moldavia.

They did not want to receive him or to see him. They just sent some servants who chased him away from all their territory for being a usurper and outlaw. When the patriarch heard these words, he grieved and felt very ashamed. He turned around and went to Doloviston and [141] then he died there from his bitterness, falling ill, unable to endure the contempt.

When the clerics learned of the death of the patriarch, the high priests gathered in order to see who was suitable to become patriarch. When the synod convened they unanimously chose the former [one].

Pachomios, the Former Patriarch Again

By the common opinion of the high priests and clerics, as well as laypeople, nobles, and the common people, they summoned this man to be patriarch again. He resumed [his place] on the patriarchal throne and reigned peacefully. At that time there lived the very wise and well-versed in theology Lord Manuel, a Peloponnesian, [who was] a great rhetor of the great church.

During his patriarchate there was an outlaw, Arsenio, born Apostolis, who received the throne of the most holy Metropolitan of Monemvasias illegally, non-canonically, and unworthily. And learn about this, how he became an outlaw. This man, I mean Arsenio, was a deacon and came from Venice to Monemvasia with a great force of the Venetians [who held] authority, as it was they that ruled [Monemvasia] then. He had consent from them [142] and from the legate of the pope, that, from the time he became high priest, that he hold the throne of Monemvasia unhindered. And whoever of the high priests or laypeople who seem adverse and disobedient to him, that he might be chastised greatly and banished from the land for his entire life. He departed for Monemvasia, and he showed the decrees of the authority of the Venetians to the lord of the place and to the nobles and to the people. And when the people of Monemvasia saw the orders, they made obeisance before him, honored him greatly, and revered him, as he was very wise. Then Arsenios, since he went there [as a] deacon, sent and called for the Bishop of Elos. He ordained him an elder. Then they took counsel together there so that Arsenios be ordained Metropolitan of Monemvasia. And in this way they

made [the Bishop of] Elos the bishop in place of the Ecumenical Patriarchal, and they appointed two priests to two of the metropolitanships, Lakedaimonia and Christianopolis. In this way they made their votes, and they gave to him the small message and the great one after the vespers. On the next day after the liturgy they ordained him Metropolitan of Monemvasia, and they dressed him in the holy garments of high priests and a very costly cloth, pallium, [143] and so on. O the illegality! O the flattery of the vile! The legitimate Metropolitan of Monemvasia, the one who had been legally ordained by the chaste great church of Christ, was healthy. The Venetians, in order to rule over his throne, drove him and his predecessors away. He, not having anywhere to reign [or] to make his throne, went to a bishop of his, who was that of Koroni, and there he made his throne, as then the [bishop] of Koroni had many people, great nobles and other useful people, and many common folk. The most criminal Arsenios, while the legitimate high priest lived, received his throne by the might of the Latins, and he committed adultery with the church of Christ God.

But behold what [kind of an] ordination he received. The bishop and the priests made him metropolitan. Shudder sun and groan earth at such an illegality. The metropolitan makes the bishop and priests according to his high priestly rank as the divine canons decree. But the bishop and priests do not make a metropolitan. How is it, does a son beget the father or does the father beget the son? This is impossible and most irreverent and illegal. But the father must have honor, as father and head of the son. The son has honor [144] as son and slave of his father, and not the other way. The patriarch, according to the patriarchal rank, as father of fathers and as shepherd of shepherds, of metropolitans, of high priests, of bishops, and of all religious and lay people of the entire *oikoumene*, ordains metropolitans. The metropolitan ordains metropolitans with the deputation of the patriarch according to the patriarchal authority and lordship. Bishop ordains bishop with the consent of the metropolitan.

But Arsenios received the throne of Monemvasia outside of the canons, as we have said. He was performing the liturgy with a priest with whom he shared the throne as metropolitan, and he performed ordinations of readers, sub-deacons, deacons, priests, and all the high priestly [class]. When the mother of churches learned this, the catholic and great [church], they sent to him an honorable patriarchal letter in order to stop his high priestly ministry, as he was unlawfully ordained and adulterating spiritually. He did not receive ordination or the grace of the Holy Spirit. The bishop has the grace of the Holy Spirit and gives it when he makes priests in accordance with the rank of

bishop. And that ordination is holy and solid through the grace of the all-holy and life-giving spirit. But [for] a bishop to ordain a metropolitan is very impious and [145] far from God and is fellowship with Satan, as the ordination is not at all in grace from the great high priest Christ, our God, and from his all-holy spirit, but [there is] anger and curse on the one ordaining and on the one being ordained.

Arsenios, when he received the honorable and venerable patriarchal letter, reckoned it as nothing. But he wrote a reply to the catholic great church insulting to great lengths the patriarch and the honorable clerics, and he, being blinded, babbled many dishonors. He did not run to the doctor, to receive treatment and cure, to the common lord and master, the Ecumenical Patriarch, to the living icon of Christ, the doctor of souls and bodies. But as the grace of God was taken from him and the devil lorded over him, he fell into despair and defended himself as behaving well.

When the patriarch and his holy synod saw his shamelessness, disobedience, and insubordination, they sent an honorable patriarchal [letter] to Monembasia, and they purged him. And behold the decree of his removal.

[146] Pachomios, by the mercy of God archbishop of Constantinople, the New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch, with our moderation presiding over the synod, and with some of the high priests present together with all of our clerics, made reference to the crime of the current Monemvasian, called Apostoli, against Christians everywhere. Purportedly gratifying the Latins, he causes scandals and confusions, and he openly **casts** excommunications out against them, this vain [person], not knowing that he is under the decrees and curses of the canons having illegally and non-canonically and unworthily proceeded into what he now claims to be. [The matters] concerning him had been managed previously by the synod, [as] we [had] found it sufficient to bring [forth] the decree against him only with living voice. But he will not stop moving stones against every Orthodox [Christian], and he doesn't care, just like Judas, where they happen to fly. And our moderation, [by pronouncement] of the synod and in writing, most legally, as a confounder and a maker of scandal against the Orthodox, has excommunicated him from the holy and consubstantial and indivisible and un-fused Trinity, one in substance, [one in] number, all powerful and the foundation of all, God, now and in the future. And having advanced unworthily and illegally to the [147] high priestly throne of Monemvasia, [our moderation] has had him purged and stripped of all priesthood and high-priestly honor. In this way we have ruled in the Holy Spirit. We have blessed and forgiven all Orthodox Christians everywhere in the Holy Spirit.

Especially those who the cursed one excommunicated, our moderation in the almighty authority of the divine and the life-giving and all-sovereign spirit has blessed and forgiven and absolved and freed them from bond and guilt. In this way we have ruled concerning these things in the Holy Spirit, whose active cause is directly the worshiped *hypostasis* of the Father. Therefore we make clear to Orthodox Christians everywhere the [charges] against him, in order that no one come to him as one having a trace of priestliness, [and] so that one not be confused by the excommunication being poured forth by him. For this reason the present written resolution of ours is being discharged in the form of an encyclical letter.

[Written] by the honorable patriarchal hand in the month of June of the twelfth indiction.

But the patriarch did not just write this deposition of Arsenios. He also wrote a deposition [order] to Crete and to [148] Kythira and to other places of the Venetians where there were Orthodox [Christians] for the priests who he had ordained, so that whoever had their bishoprics from him be excommunicated. For he gave permission to priests and deacons [who were] ordained to go to other legal high priests to ordain them a second time according to the law, since the first was not an ordination because it lay outside of the canons.

Thus when the transgressor learned this, that the patriarch sent such letters against him, he was not able, because of his shame, to reside anymore in Monembasia. But he left from there at once and went to the Pope, and he explained to him and also to the cardinals hard and fearful words, that the Romans consider the Pope and the cardinals to be heretics. When the Pope heard this, knowing that Arsenios is very wise and a part of the church of old Rome, he wrote many things to the authority of Venice against the Roman Christians. Arsenios took this [letter] and brought it to the authority. And there was much confusion and trepidation in the church of the Romans, Great George, and many of the Romans ran the risk of being put to death, compelled by Arsenios. But [149] it did not come to pass as he reckoned. He died from bitterness, unrepentant, in a [state of] excommunication. His soul went where [that of] Nestorius the heretic and the others [went]. And after a while his pitiful black body was found, like a drum. For a man to see it was fear and trembling.

This sultan took Methoni by the blade, which the Venetians had ruled over, and all the men, old and young, down to the age of twelve. He gave the order, and they

made two towers with their heads. They are visible to this day. This happened one thousand five-hundred years after the birth of Christ.

Sultan Bayezid died during the patriarchate of the above-mentioned Lord Pachomios after reigning for thirty-nine years. During his reigns, these were the patriarchs, [whose names] we have written again:

Niphon of Thessaloniki

Dionysios the former patriarch

Maximos of Serres

Niphon the former patriarch

Ioakeim of Drama

[150] Pachomios of Zichna

Ioakeim again for the second time

Pachomios again for the second time

During the patriarchate of Lord Pachomios the sultan, who was the second emperor, died, as we said. His son was Sultan Selim. This patriarch shepherded the church of Christ well and piously, as scandals [and] confusion stopped.

After [some] days he prepared, and he took some clerics, religious and lay, and went to Vlachia and Pogdania.²⁵⁴ The lords, nobles, and all of the people of that place received [him] with all piety, and they gave him many gifts. Thus he blessed them and took his retinue, and they were coming here to the City. When he came to Silivri, his monk, Theodoulos by name, poisoned him, compelled by some clerics. Immediately he started vomiting blood from his mouth, and it was leaking from his behind, like water from a tube. And when they saw that he was dying, they put him on a cart and brought him to the great church. Then he died, and they buried him there.

[151] When [Patriarch Pachomios] died, Lord Theoleptos was present here, Metropolitan of Ioannina, who was a monk of the same Lord Pachomios. Before the high priests arrived to form a synod, so that they might elect the patriarch, he ran to Hadrianopolis, where the emperor, Sultan Selim, was present. He gave [Selim] a gift (*peşkeş*), kissed his hand, then received a *berat* and went to the Universal Church.

²⁵⁴ Moldavia and Wallachia.

Theoleptos, Metropolitan of Ioannina

After he received this imperial *berat*, the high priests and clerics sat for the synod. They voted, gave him both the small and great messages, and sat him on the most high patriarchal throne as patriarch. He received the pastoral crook from the Herakleian, and he shepherded the Great Church of Christ.

Then, during the patriarchal reign of Lord Theoleptos, Sultan Selim, the third emperor, died, and his son, Sultan Suleiman, became emperor. During the reign of Sultan Selim, who lived [*sic*] for eight and a half years, there was no other patriarch, only Lord Theoleptos.

[152] While Sultan Suleiman was reigning they accused the patriarch on charge of carnality, and there was great confusion in the great Universal Church. When the synod formed concerning this, from [among] the most honored clerics, they declared that they sought a decree from the sultan, so that the high priests might gather and that this business of the accusation against the patriarch might be investigated, whether it was truth or lies, [whether or not] his accusers and their witnesses were credible. Then when the clerics gathered in the royal divan, they received a decree. And while they were preparing to send [notice], so that they might assemble the high priests, suddenly He purged him with his divine blade, the great high priest of high priests, Christ our God, king of kings, who knows men's secrets, those of both the just and of sinners. He dispensed to that man according to his works, and the patriarch fell into a deep illness, and suddenly he died. Soon afterwards Sultan Suleiman accepted sovereignty. When [the patriarch] died, they buried him outside of the Pammakaristos, near the late patriarch Lord Pachomios, and their memorials are seen to this day

When this patriarch died some of the high priests were gathered. A synod formed in Sophia and they cast their votes.

Jeremiah I, Metropolitan of Sophia

[153] After this patriarch was elected by the high priests and clerics and all of the Christians, they gave him the small message, and [they gave him] the large one after the completion of the vespers. He performed the Eucharist and then received the crook from the Metropolitan of Herakleias, as is the rule and law. After ascending upon the highest patriarchal throne, he blessed the people of the Lord and prayed. He served on the patriarchal throne for a fair amount of time, and he was much beloved by the clergy and laymen because he was very humble and peaceful.

He decided to go to Jerusalem for veneration of the life-receiving tomb of our Lord Jesus Christ. He prepared, and he led with him clerics, deacons, and venerable laymen. They went to Cyprus by boat, and they disembarked on the island. And while the patriarch and his synod were there, scandal came amongst them. Some of the clerics left the patriarch there, and they boarded the ship and went to Constantinople. The patriarch found a boat in Cyprus, and passed [over sea] and arrived upon land, and he went to Jerusalem. [154] He adored the holy tomb of Christ and all the holy places, and he was very joyous, because he was deemed worthy of this pleasure. When the clerics came to the great church, some of the high priests [had already] learned of their coming, how they returned from the patriarch scandalized. They mounted on horseback and went to the patriarchate, and they spoke with the nobles and clerics and conspired against the patriarch. They summoned a synod in order to remove him from the patriarchal throne. They went and made an increase to the *harac*, 500 *florins*. Together it became 4000, because 3500 florins were from the first patriarchs, as it appears written before, who made the increase. The enemies of Lord Jeremiah, high priests, clerics, and a few of the nobles, sat in the synod, and they chose as patriarch the [metropolitan of] Sozopolis.

Ioannikios I of Sozopolis

When they chose him, they cast their votes, gave him the short message and the great one, and sat him on the patriarchal throne with much haste, [155] as they feared lest Jeremiah might fly like an eagle and come to his throne and lest they be unable to appoint their candidate. But the majority of the pious and devout Christians, both of the city and of Galata, did not go to see or to make obeisance before him. Only those who installed him, and not anyone else. And when pitiful Joannikios saw this condemnation, that though he was sitting on the patriarchal throne, it did not induce anyone to make obeisance before him as patriarch, but rather they affronted him and cursed him, he became very distressed, not only him, but also his entire entourage. And they were lamenting greatly the condemnation which was going to befall them.

While the patriarch, Lord Jeremias, was in Jerusalem, he heard about the trespass and about culpable Ioannikios, the increase he had made, how he had removed him from the patriarchal throne, and [how] he had taken it himself. The four patriarchs united with him and they performed a mass. After the liturgy they excommunicated he who wrongly became patriarch, and all who advised him. After doing this there, in Jerusalem, for some days with the Ecumenical Patriarch, Lord Jereimas, the patriarchs went to their own thrones. And Lord Jeremias, the patriarch, went by land, that is to say by solid ground, [156] with his coterie to Constantinople to see to the end [of this matter]. And when he approached these parts, he met the noble Praipasha,²⁵⁵ and he made obeisance before him. They exchanged greetings, for the pasha loved him greatly. The pasha himself was going to a place where he might make investigation into great matters. And he told the patriarch, “Go to Galata and stay there until I come so that I might give you your position.” [The patriarch] made obeisance before him and he went to Galata to the Church of Chyrsopigis, and he stayed. And, what a marvel, when the people heard, they ran. There was such a great multitude of people that for three days they were rushing [to him] and kissing his holy hand. And when the pasha came

²⁵⁵ Probably Piri Mehmet Pasha.

and sat in the divan, all the people came, and they were shouting with loud voices, “My sultan, we do not want the illegal patriarch Ioannikion in our church. We want only the first [man] who became [patriarch] according to our law and faith.” And so the pasha made a petition (*arzu*) for the emperor. And he ruled that the will of the people be fulfilled. The first patriarch was, truly, to assent to the five hundred florins, which the other patriarch put on top of the *harac*. The next day the pasha sat in the *divan*, and the two patriarchs and all of the people came. Then the pasha proclaimed the decision of the emperor. [157] And when Lord Ieremiah heard that he [had to] assent to the increase, he said that I do not assent to this, and I would rather resign [instead]. And the pious people, when they heard this, ran and kissed the foot of the pasha, and they accepted the increase, although Lord Ieremias himself was unwilling. And they seized Ieremias and they went and sat him on the patriarchal throne with the great sergeant (*çavuş*) of the emperor. And a great joy came over the City and over Galata on that day, and they celebrated with the neighboring villages.

Ieremias, the Patriarch Again

When he sat for the second time on the most lofty patriarchal throne, he loved his supporters greatly, and he made peace with his enemies and he pardoned them. The world was rejoicing, because, as has been written, he was a peaceful and humble man. And the illegal patriarch, Ioannikion, they drove out of the city, and he went away full of shame, sworn at, reproached, and cursed by all Orthodox Christians. And after a short while he died badly and painfully, and he was found cursed and swollen like a drum, as he had been excommunicated [158] by the four patriarchs as a culprit, and the miserable man was [thus] damned.

From the time that Lord Ieremias took the patriarchal throne for the second time, great confusion and disorder came upon The Great Church and all of the pious people, religious and lay. For all of the learned and wise men of the Turks gathered bearing the news written in their documents that Constantinople was seized by the blade by Sultan Mehmed. They produced a *fetva* [stating] that, whatever stronghold is captured by the blade without [the occupants having] made obeisance, in that stronghold the rites of

Roman church will not be performed, and [a Roman church] will not even exist. [Instead] they should demolish them from the foundation. And the Turks kept this *fetva* a secret because they were sure of the seizure of the city, when they smote the emperor and the entire people, and that it was taken by the blade, as we have said. And they had prepared to run in one day and to destroy the Great Church and as many other churches as are found present here in the City, according to the resolution of the *fetva* and of imperial order. But the noble Xenakis had a great friendship with the *kadi-asker* of that time. This noble went to make obeisance before him, as it was his custom every few days, so that he would not neglect [due] servility. When [the noble] went, the [*kadi-asker*] said, [159] “Know that in five days they will demolish all your churches and the patriarchate from the foundation, because a *fetva* [has been produced, stating] that in any stronghold that they fought and won by the sword, there shall be no Rum church, and none is to be found.” When Xenakis heard this, the look on his face changed, and he became like a corpse, and he trembled. After making obeisance before the *kadi-asker*, he departed and went to the Great Church. He went up to the patriarch with many tears, and he was not able to speak. And the patriarch asked him, “Why are you distressed and why the tears?” After some time, he said, “A *fetva* and decree of the emperor [was] produced [stating] that since the city was taken by the sword through war, all the churches of the Christians within [the city are to be] destroyed.” When the patriarch heard this, a great fear and tremor came upon him, and sweat fell down from his face like rain from the heaven to the earth. And after some time he went down from his little holy cell, and he gave orders and they opened the church. And he stood in front of the icon of the Pammakaristos, and he recited a tearful entreaty from his soul, and he kissed the Pammakaristos. Thus he left the church, and he mounted a mule, and with the noble Xenakis [160] he went to the pasha, because the patriarch had freedom of speech with him and was much loved by the pasha. Toulhipasias, the grand vizier, was also [there]. Since he was united with the pasha, he explained to him that he should go to the *divan* and say that when Sultan Mehmed came to seize the city, at first they were giving war, and he demolished part of its walls. Then the Emperor Constantine came out bearing the keys of the fortress. He both made obeisance before the sultan and handed [the keys] over to him, and the sultan gladly received him, his nobles, and the people. And when the patriarch heard the words of the pasha, he accepted the gentle suggestion. On that day he ran to all the important men, the first of the Porte, and the rest of the people, and he gave gifts according to station.

And the next day the *divan* had a momentous meeting, which was heard of in the entire city. The Turks, Rums, Armenians, Hebrews, and every other group convened. There was such a multitude that the people stood all the way to the Hagia Sophia in order to hear the emperor. And the patriarch went to the *divan*, and after he made obeisance he stood before the pashas, and he was looking at them, and he marveled at their distinction and frankness. And a great amount of sweat was pouring from his face, [161] and he drenched his cloak and all his clothes, just as Christ at his passion. And the most distinguished noble was with the patriarch, Lord Demetrios Kantakouzenos, and also the noble Xenakis. Then the pasha said, “Patriarch, a *fetva* and decree of the emperor has been issued, [stating] that [neither] here in the city nor in the other strongholds of the emperor, those which other emperors, his ancestors, seized with the sword, shall you Rum have any Rum Church. And tell your priests, if they have their own vestments in the churches, which belong to your order and which you wear, or documents, and if you have any other thing, take them away from the churches and shut the doors of the churches, as we wish to do with them whatever the *fetva* and the decree of the emperor commands. And the patriarch replied to him with a loud voice, and he said to the pasha, “My sultan, I do not speak of other fortresses outside the city, but I say that as far as the city is concerned at that time when Sultan Mehmed came to conquer it, Emperor Constantine Palaiologos and his nobles and people made obeisance before him and gave the fortress to him willingly.” When the patriarch said these words to the pasha, he responded and said, “For these words which you say, do you have Muslim witnesses, [162] who were in the army of Sultan Mehmed when he came and seized the city, so that we might know how he seized it, whether by war, or by submission?” The patriarch replied, “I have, my sultan.” The pasha said to the patriarch, “Come tomorrow to the *divan*, and we will make a petition to the emperor, and let him decree [as he will].”

The patriarch left the pasha with his entourage, and a whole multitude of Christians followed him and went with him to the Patriarchate, and they all said with one voice, “Not only will we give *florins* for our church, that we might free them, but we would also die, both us and our children.” When the patriarch heard these words from the people he thanked them many times, and he blessed them, and thus he went up to his holy cell.

And the next day the clerics and nobles came and took the patriarch, and they went to the *divan*. Following them were all of the Christian people, both of the city and

of Galata, religious and lay. And when they came to the divan, once again the patriarch stood with the clerics and nobles in front of the pashas. Then Toulphipasha, as Grand Vizier, said, [163] “Patriarch, as I [was coming] here to the imperial *divan*, I went and made obeisance before the emperor, and I made a petition (*arzu*) to him. He ruled that you bring these Muslims which you said that you have [as] witnesses, so that we might ask them what they know concerning this. And when we hear them, again there will be a petition (*arzu*) [presented] to the emperor, and [it will be] as he wills. Now bring forth your witnesses.” Then the patriarch answered, and he said to the vizier, “My sultan, my witnesses are not here, but in Hadrianopolis, and I request a twenty day delay, so that I might send for them and bring them.” When the pasha heard this he granted the delay. And thus the patriarch made obeisance, and he went out from the *divan* with his entourage and went to the Great Church. Right away he sent [off] the most able men. They set out for Hadrianopolis with great presents and gifts, and they found the Muslims for whom they came, so that they might bring them back. And they conversed with them. They received the gifts into their hands, just as they wanted. Then they mounted and went together with the messengers sent by the patriarch at the Great Church. And the patriarch went down to the court, and embraced them and received them with much love. Then and there, they sat, and he brought for them various foods and garments. They took a rest. Then [164] on the second day he took them and they went to the pasha. And the pasha, for the sake of the patriarch, for the love which he had for him, spoke with him, and he prepared them, so that they might bear witness just as the patriarch had said to them. And he conveyed to them that they [need] not fear anyone. Thus the patriarch departed with them from the pasha, and they went to the patriarchate.

And on the next day the patriarch took them, and they went to the royal *divan*. [The patriarch] appeared in front of the pashas, and he made obeisance before them. He left the witnesses outside the dispensating *divan*. When the pasha saw him, he said, “Patriarch, the delay, which you took of twenty days in order to bring the witnesses, it has come and passed. Now what do you have to say? Be careful that you not lie to the emperor, lest you fall into his great wrath, chastisement, and condemnation.” Then the patriarch answered the pasha, and he said “My sultan, within the delayed time period, I took and brought my witnesses. And to the sovereign I will not lie, and not to your lord.” And the pasha said, “Where are they?” And the patriarch said, “They stand outside the *divan* with my own monks.” Then when the pasha heard this, he

immediately sent a sergeant. He ran [out] [165] and brought them before the pashas. When [the pashas] saw them, they were amazed at their age. For their beards were white just like clean snow. Tears were flowing from their eyes, and the [parts] around [their eyes] were red like flesh. Their hands and feet trembled from old age. And the pasha said to one of them, "What is your name?" He replied, "Mustafa." "And what was your father's name?" He said, "Genouzi." And he said to the other, the second, "What is your name?" He answered, "Piris." "And your father, how was he called?" "Roustamis," he said. Then he said, "How many years has it been since Sultan Mehmed conquered Constantinople." And they replied that it was eighty four years as of today. He said again, "How old were you?" They said, "We were both about eighteen." He said back to them, "How old are you now?" They replied that they are one hundred and two. When the first pasha heard this he marveled and shuddered with the other pashas. And he said back to them, "What was your position at that time in the sultan's army?" They replied, "nopechides,"²⁵⁶ that is, janissaries, [whom] the Franks would call *soldati*. He said back, "How did the sultan seize the city, by war or by submission?" They said to the pasha that it submitted. [166] "And listen, my sultan, to how it happened, so that you know the matter in detail."

"When we came here with the army and sultan we camped outside and settled. We did not give battle until the armada came, the galleys, from the Black Sea. And when it came, the sultan told the emperor of the Rum to give the fortress willingly, that he might make him a brother, that they might be two lords and emperors, and that he should give him whatever repose he may want, or a fort or other revenues, that he might prosper with his nobles. But the emperor did not accept the word of the sultan, nor did his nobles. [The sultan became] filled with anger, and then he gave the order, and we made war, the galleys by sea and we from dry land. The world became dark from the bombardments, the guns, and the multitude of people. The day seemed like night. Many great men from the army of the sultan were killed in this battle, the *beylerbeyi* of Rumelia, that is of the west, *aghas*, standard-bearers, *sipahis*, and many others. We made a lot of trouble for the Romans with bombardments, guns, and arrows, and we took down a part of the walls of the stronghold, and some of the buildings.

[167] "Then, when the emperor of the Romans saw the multitude of his men who were killed, he feared lest they might capture the stronghold and decapitate the men. He

²⁵⁶ "Nöbetçi," Turkish for "on duty."

sent messengers from among the nobles of his palace to my sultan. They made obeisance [before the sultan] in the same way [that they would] before their own emperor in order to make peace, to give the stronghold, in order that he might grant repose [to the emperor] with his nobles, so that [the sultan] would not approach, pillage, or enslave the populace, but rather that the sultan would leave them in their houses, so that they might be left in peace apart from any forced levy or any other burden. And when the sultan heard these words of the messengers as if from the emperor himself, he received them very well with great joy, and he gave them a decree in writing and said the following words: ‘I Emperor, Sultan Mehmed through this written decree perform an act of charity for the emperor of the city, Constantine Paleologos, and his nobles, to grant them, namely whatever they ask in a just way, to be able to live prosperously as nobles, to have comfort and slaves, male and female. And for the rest of the people I will that they be free from any forced levy and any burden. At no time will I take their children [in order to make them] Janissaries, neither I nor the successors of my kingdom ever at any time. But let my present [168] decree stand firm and steadfast.’ The sultan gave this decree via the messengers, that they might give it to the Emperor Constantine. They bowed, went to the emperor, and gave the decree. When the emperor saw the decree of the sultan, he rejoiced greatly, and he immediately took the keys of the stronghold and his nobles and some of the people, and he went out. He went to the tent of the sultan, and he handed over the keys into his hands. And the sultan embraced the emperor and kissed him and sat him on his right side. He gave the command, and they staged great festivities for three days and three nights. And thus the emperor took the sultan, and they entered the city, and he handed it over.”

When the pasha heard these things from the witnesses, he went to the sultan and made a request (*arzu*) to him [regarding] all these things, and he mentioned the old age and many years of the witnesses. And when the sultan heard these things he marveled greatly, and right away he ordered, and they gave a decree to the patriarch that he not [endure] any further trial or annoyance concerning this issue of the churches, until the world comes to an end.

And when the patriarch received the decree, he went to the patriarchate [169] with all the Christian people, and he posted the decree on the sacristy. And on that day they performed with all piety prayers and thanks to our Lord Jesus Christ and to the Pammakaristos, the all glorious holy Theotokos, the hope and anchor of our pious Orthodox Christians. The Christians were glad and rejoiced because of the good that

happened, and the great Catholic Church and all the rest of the churches of the city and of Galata were freed. And behold the word of our Lord Jesus Christ was fulfilled, which he said in the divine and holy Gospel to Peter, “You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church. The Gates of Hades will not overpower it.”²⁵⁷

And this patriarch, Lord Jeremias, restored from top to bottom the monastery of the victorious cross, called great Nicholas, on the Holy Mountain, which was a deserted place. And he made a great and awesome church with forecourts, and he decorated it in a beautiful and resplendent way. He made the cells of the monks and the towers and altars. And he built a great and strong wall around it, and he adorned it like a castle. And he put up venerable and diverse vessels, [170] gold and silver, and many [cultivated] fields, which is *mülk*, for nourishment of the monks.

And while he reigned as patriarch, the archbishop, whose name was Prochoros, of former Ioustiniane, [now called] Achreidon, came here to Constantinople. He appeared in the *divan*, and he showed an imperial bull, which said and decreed that his archbishopric should include Berroia, which was [under the] oversight of the Metropolis of Thessaloniki. Then he gave a one hundred florins *harac* for them. And when the patriarch learned that he gave the *harac*, he became disquieted [and he was wondering] what to do so that [the archbishop] would not take these places.²⁵⁸ And thus they advised him, and he went and received a *fetva*. And the *fetva* said that if someone owns something and if he rules it for one hundred years, then no one can take it away from his hands. [The patriarch] appeared in the *divan*, showed the *fetva*, and he demonstrated that the Church of Constantinople had it for more than three hundred years. And when the pashas heard this they thought it right that he have it hereafter because he consented to the one hundred *florins*, the increase of Prochoros. And the patriarch, not able to do anything else, consented to these things. And they drove Prochoros out of the *divan*. And the entire *harac* [171] of the great church of Constantinople became four thousand one hundred *florins*. And they give it each year [on the day of George the Great] to the most-high Porte of the sultan.

And the patriarch wanted to go to Vlachia and Pougдания. Therefore he departed from the Great Church, and he went with some nobles and clerics. And in the province of the most holy metropolitan of Tornovos he fell ill and died. While he was sick, he became a monk and was renamed John. And his soul went up to heavenly quarters, and

²⁵⁷ Matthew 16:18.

²⁵⁸ The Ecumenical Patriarchate owns Church property in Thessaloniki.

they buried his holy body honorably and piously. He sat on the patriarchal throne twenty-three years and [some] months. He ordained all of the metropolitans and archbishops, and to many thrones even two and three times, except for the Nichomedian Lord Dionysios, whom he did not ordain. Lord Dionysios and Lord Jeremias were ordained by the former Patriarch Theoleptos. The Nichomedian himself took the patriarchal throne after the death of Lord Jeremias, as the passage written below shows.

The clerics of the great church, when they learned of the death of the patriarch, wrote to the neighboring high priests. They gathered together, and a great synod formed of high priests, [172] clerics, nobles, and many other useful men. At that time the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Lord Germanos, was present at the Great Church and sat in the synod. And after conversing at length about the patriarchal throne, they came to an agreement, stopped, and wrote a scroll. The Patriarch of Jerusalem signed below, along with all of the high priests, as many as were found, and the clerics. The scroll said that he of the high priests who wanted to become patriarch in any way without the gathering of the high priests, metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops of the east, west, and of the Peloponnesus, namely the Morea, that he be self-deposed from the high priesthood and from the throne. And the Herakleian proclaimed the excommunication with pallium and stole. Thus they unanimously sent messengers to the high priests with royal decree, and they gathered all the high priests, and they made a *sicilat* for the *kadi*. It was the desire of some high priests and clerics and nobles, whoever did not go to the patriarchate, that that when all the high priests be gathered, then a synod might form so that they might depose and banish many adverse [forces] from the Great Church. [173] First, Simony, concerning which there is an assertion of the divine apostles, and many other wicked and illegal things which were present. And then, that they might also choose a patriarch who will [reign] peacefully and free from scandal, apart from any temptation.

But the people of Galata had a great love for the Nichomedian metropolitan, Lord Dionysius, since he was a native of Galata who was born and brought up there. Not only the Galatians loved him, but also the Karamanians, and they desired very much to make him patriarch. And on the seventeenth of the month of April, on the Sabbath of just Lazarus, a synod formed concerning some matters. High priests, clerics, some of the nobles, and many other men sat, and the multitude of people were in the courtyard. And after they sat there they came to the topic of the patriarch, [namely] who the high priests should make [patriarch] when they assemble. Then the great treasurer was

brought up, upright Serpetis, from the place where he was sitting, and he said in a loud voice, “Holy high priests, most honorable brother clerics, and all the people of Christ, listen: The former patriarch, Lord Jeremias stated many times when he sat with us clerics, than after he dies no other person become patriarch, only the holy Nikomedian, because he is a long-serving high priest, an elder, humble and [174] peaceful.” When they heard this some of the high priests, some of the clerics, the people of Galata, the Karamanians, and as many others who loved the Nikomedian rose up. The group snatched him and the high priests and brought them into the Great Church. They voted and gave him the small message and the great one after the vespers of palms, and they sat him on the patriarchal throne.²⁵⁹

Dionysios, Metropolitan of Nikomedia

On Palm Sunday they mounted him [on a horse] and took him to the pashas, and he made obeisance before them. They took neither the scroll nor the excommunication to heart. When he sat on the patriarchal throne, the entire Holy Week, that is the holy and awesome sufferings of our savior Jesus Christ, passed without any trouble. The resurrection came. And while chanting about it, they were weeping along the roads. Turks, Rums, Armenians, Hebrews and every other tribe, wept and shouted in a loud voice, “The fleemarket and *bedesten* are burning!” The pitiable merchants [went] to their workshops to save [some of] the clothes from their merchandise. At that time great destruction and upheaval, poverty and nakedness, [175] came upon the merchants, as many paupers became rich and many rich men became paupers.

The nobles of the city, when they learned that he became patriarch became greatly distressed. They ran to the great church and went to the high priests saying, “What is this? The scroll’s letters haven’t even dried yet. The stole and pallium of the excommunicate are still outside; they still have not been placed back on the sacristy. Your signatures rest [there, declaring] that if any one of the high priests makes an attempt on the patriarchal throne without a meeting of all the high priests, he is self-

²⁵⁹ Thus he became patriarch contrary to the rulings of the scroll that had recently been composed by the synod.

deposed. Aren't these the laws? Aren't these [your] statements? Don't you know that when you made him patriarch, your laws deposed both you and him?" The high priests replied, "Truly the laws would depose us, if we willingly infringed on the law and our signatures. But this thing which we did was compulsory for us because they seized us, we who were sitting in the synod, by force, and some carried us away by the feet, others by the hands, and yet others by the waist. They tore our priestly headgear and veils to the ground, confined us bareheaded in the church, and told us [their] resolution: "Either make the Nichomedian patriarch, [176] or we will kill you." When the nobles heard these words they summoned the synod that next week. When the high priests sat they asked that the scroll be read. But the patriarch, Lord Dionysios, and those privy to his will, were willing neither to speak [with them] nor to reply. The nobles and most of the high priests, when they saw this disdain, petitioned the pasha (who was Rüstem Pasha, the grand vezir and son-in-law of the emperor) and they made an increase to the *peşkeş*, in order that this subject of the scroll might be investigated, whether he became patriarch legally and canonically and we should make obeisance before him as our patriarch, or whether he became patriarch illegally such that he should be deposed. But the patriarch was not willing to listen to this. He only consented to the increase of the *peşkeş*. The high priests and the nobles, however, when they saw that he consented to the increase, again made an [even] greater increase. The *peşkeş* was five-hundred *florins* from the beginning, and then the increase was three thousand *florins*. The patriarch, with his friends [from among] the high priests, clerics, and some of the people formed a synod amongst them, concerning what they should do about this. They agreed that they would give a supplication to the king, since the grand vizier Rüstem Pasha was a great enemy of the patriarch. After they set this up, they made the supplication, [177] writing as if on behalf of the whole populace, that they want this patriarch, Lord Dionysios. And one day the emperor went by sea to Camelogephyrum, and when these Christians learned this, they ran there carrying the supplication. They made obeisance and gave it [to him]. And the emperor, when he came to his palace (*saray*), read the supplication, and then he summoned Rüstem and reproached him many times concerning this. Finally he stated his decision: "May the will of my people come to be." The pasha, not knowing what to do, for fear of the emperor, sent a sergeant and took the patriarch from Galata, where he was to be found after being chased there, and he brought him to the patriarchate and sat him on the patriarchal throne.

After a few days he received the *peşkeş*, three thousand florins, and he took them to the *divan* and handed them over to the *defterdar*. [The *defterdar*] took [the patriarch], and he went and kissed the hand of the emperor, as is the custom of patriarchs. [The emperor] granted him a *berat*. After he received it, he sat on the throne and made decisions fearlessly. His opponents, the high priests, since they could not do anything to him, made obeisance before him as their lord and sovereign and patriarch. Each of them went one by one to his own thrown.

In the days of this patriarch there were many [178] scandals, confusions, and troubles between him and the high priests and clerics, and there were many synods and disorders.

This patriarch built inside the patriarchate, in the western part, four cells above, and below them he made another four. Near these he made a large and fine stable. He also made two lecterns, which the cantors use, one on the right [side of the] choir and one on the left, and some other furnishings.

When Lord Dionysios was patriarch, they took down the cross, by decree of the pasha, from the top of the Church of the All-Blessed at the patriarchate. This [cross] was on top of the bell-tower and was visible from a long distance by land and sea. Every Christian recognized the patriarchate whenever he saw the cross. When they took it down, it brought great sadness to the Christians.

This patriarch became sick and died. They chanted in the church of the All-Blessed with all reverence. They buried his body in the monastery of the very holy Bearer of God, in Chalcis, in his monastery.

When the high priests heard about the death of the patriarch, many ran, some from the east and [some] from [179] the west. Convening the synod with the common knowledge of the high priests, clerics, nobles, and all of the people they elected as patriarch the all-holy metropolitan of Hadrianopolis, Lord Joseph. They gave him the small message and the large one while singing the vespers. After performing the Eucharist he received into his hands the pastoral staff from the Herakleian. And after making obeisance before him, he kissed his hand. The most honored and wise great archivist of the most holy great Church of Christ, Lord Alexander of Tiras, gave him the great message.

Ioasaph, Metropolitan of Hadrianopolis

When this man became patriarch, the whole populace ran, religious and lay, old and young, and made obeisance before him. Nevertheless, as we have said, the *peşkeş* was three thousand florins because they had made that addition to it. And the former patriarch, Lord Dionysios, had given them this much. But when Lord Ioasaph became patriarch, he saved a lot of [money] and gave gifts and cut a thousand florins from the *peşkeş*. And two thousand remained. He took [that money], went to the *divan*, kissed the emperor's hand, and received a *berat*.

[180] After a few days had elapsed, he knocked down the old and decayed scaffolds which surrounded all of the patriarchate's enclosure, and he brought lime, stones, tiles, and bricks. He built all round [the patriarchate] and made it like a very handsome, well guarded stronghold. He also built two large and very comely residences, [which are] on the left as you leave the patriarchate, near the holy patriarchal cell. He also made a kitchen and mill, [as well as] accessories for the great church, a silver censor, a silver basin, two silver candelabrams, and other precious, radiant, and golden utensils and vestements.

This patriarch, however, was very arrogant and over praised, and he came into great scandals with the highly honored clerics and with the high born nobles. He summoned and gathered all of the high priests of the east, west, and of the Peloponnesus, and they came and gathered in the Great Church. [He called them] so that he might have their aid in overthrowing his enemies. [But] when the synod formed they outed him as a Simoniac, and in accordance with the decision of the holy apostolic canons, they cleansed him from the high priesthood and from the patriarchal throne and honor.

Behold his removal from office!

[181] Never did the enemy and foe of our salvation [Satan] become satisfied. From the beginning he was always opposing human nature and arming [himself] against the Church of Christ, plotting at some times with various heresies, at others rousing corrupt humans, [whoever would] listen to him, against the holy apostolic and patristic

canons. Now when ours sin had multiplied he openly aroused a persecutor, enemy and corrupter of the ecclesiastical establishment, the reigning patriarch Ioasaph, who suffered from a fearlessness of God, as a man undeterred, and committed every sort of unlawful act outside the provisions of the holy canons. Thereupon, we the high priests who constitute the synod, having been notified and upon examining these things, we considered it appropriate to thoroughly look into the [accusations] against the patriarch [placing these things] before all other ecclesiastical affairs. And they were casting their eyes on the accusations being spoken against him by the great treasurer of the great Universal Church, the presbyter Lord Anastasios, and by the great accountant Lord Hierakos, and, among the nobles, by Lord Antonios Kantakouzinios and Lord Michael Gabra. After they listened to the meticulous inquiry and investigation, we found him [to be] not only unjust and rapacious, but also [guilty of] breaching the [bounds of] the distinction given to him by the high priests and **[182]** of openly perpetrating the most illegal and impious deed of Simon, and of breaching (since he confessed with his own lips) the twenty ninth canon of the holy apostles, the one which says that “If a bishop or a presbyter or a deacon becomes holder of this rank through money, let him and whoever ordained him be purged, and let them be cut off altogether from communion, as Simon Magus was by me Peter.” Moreover, without urgent necessity and without the opinion of the synod or the knowledge of the clerics he sold off the possessions of the great Universal Church in Crete, which were dedicated in times immemorial. He confessed that he did this, [contrary to] the twenty sixth canon of Carthage which states, “It is best that no one sell ecclesiastical property. If one has no revenue and some great necessity impels, reveal this to the leader of the eparchy and with a fixed number of bishops deliberate as to what needs to be done. And if the need of the church is so great that he is unable to make deliberations before selling, [then] the bishop will call his neighbors to witness, making it his concern to show to the synod all the circumstances of the church. If he does not do this, let the one who sells be considered to be responsible to God and the synod, and let him be bereft of his own honor.” Moreover **[183]** he made unreasonable dismissals of high priests, and later pardons, namely to Kabala Neophyti (dismissed together with him was his Father Klonari, who married two women in Thassos) and Elasson Gregory and Peritheorios Dositheou. In a similar way he made many non-canonical ordinations in the eparchy of Chalcedon, of Herakleia, of Thessaloniki (Lord Theona), and of Methymna. But further yet, [he performed] ordinations of untested [people] and [was subject to] many other flagrant accusations

which were attested. When we saw this, so that we ourselves not be liable to deposition and anathema, as people who associate themselves with an excommunicate, we deemed him unfit for the high priesthood, as the one mainly responsible for the transgression of the divine and holy canons, and we deposed him and considered him rejected and estranged from the honor of being patriarch and its title, so that he might not be able in any way again to accept either the patriarchal throne or its office, but that he might live alone among the monks. And so the declaration and confirmation of these things was completed and the decision of our synod [was taken] before the Holy Gospel and after having already proclaimed his excommunication. In the year seven thousand seventy three, in the month of January, in the eighth indiction

[184] We also commanded that if one of us signing high priests, after some time passes, should want to acquit him, he will legally and canonically be deposed, and after breaking his own legal signature, either through a third person or by himself, he shall be self-deposed and estranged from the high priesthood and liable to anathema.

Paisios archbishop of Acheidai willingly signed.

The very humble metropolitan of Kaisareia, Mitrophanes, willingly signed.

The humble metropolitan of Tornovos, Arsenios, signed.

The humble metropolitan of Kyzikos, Ioasaph, signed.

The humble metropolitan of Thessaloniki, Theonas.

The humble metropolitan of Nikaia, Kyrillos, signed.

The humble metropolitan of Chalkedon, Euthumios, signed.

The humble metropolitan of Larissa, Neophytos, signed.

The humble metropolitan of Hadrianopolis, Arsenios.

The humble metropolitan Ioasaph.

The humble metropolitan of Anchialos, Xenophon, signed.

The humble metropolitan of Korinthos, Sophronios, signed.

[185] The humble metropolitan Gregorios of Prousis signed.

The humble metropolitan of Philipopolis, Arsenios.

The humble metropolitan of Paronaxia, Veniamin.

The humble metropolitan of Old Patros, Germanos.

The humble metropolitan of Thebes, Ioasaph.

The humble metropolitan of Lakedaimonia, Grigorios.

The humble metropolitan of Mitylini, Makarios.

The humble metropolitan of Mesimvria, Matthaïos.

The humble metropolitan of Hierissos and of the holy mountain, David.

The humble metropolitan of Rhyzaïos, Ioakeim.

The humble metropolitan of Athens, Sophronios.

The humble metropolitan of Naupaktos and of Arti, Ioakeim.

The humble metropolitan of Varna, Gabriel, signed.

The humble metropolitan of the Christianopolis, Makarios, having the consent of Monemvasia.

The humble metropolitan of Didymotoichos, Sophronios, signed.

The humble metropolitan of Dristis, Parthenios, signed.

The humble metropolitan of Midia, Ioakeim, signed.

[186] The humble metropolitan of Sozopoleos, Philotheos, signed.

The humble metropolitan of Zichnai, Grigorios, signed.

The humble metropolitan of Limnos, Neophytos, signed.

The humble bishop of Crete, Damaskinos, signed.

The humble bishop of Kasandria, Kosmas, signed.

The humble bishop of Poleanninis and of Bardioritai, Makarios.

The humble bishop of Zitouvios, Iakobos, signed.

The humble bishop of Drinoupoleos, Makarios, signed.

The humble bishop of Damalai and Polyphengos, Joseph.

The humble bishop of Fanarios, Grigorios, signed.

The humble bishop of Olenis, Sisois, signed.

The humble bishop of Aulon, Laurentios, signed.

The humble bishop of Solon, Anthimos, signed.

Belas Antonios, the humble bishop of Ioanninai, with his permission, signed.

The humble bishop of Phanarios, Gabriel, with the permission of Thaumakos, signed.

The humble bishop of Dimitria, Theophilos, with the permission of Litza and Agraphon.

The humble bishop of Rhentinis, Damaskinos, with the permission of the Serbs signed.[187] The humble bishop of Metron and Athyron, Prokopios, with permission from Myriophytos.

The humble metropolitan of Kastoria, Ioasaf, chief bishop of all Bulgaria, signed willingly with his own hand.

The humble bishop of Stroumnitzis, Ananias, willingly signed by his own volition.

The humble bishop of Melenikos signed.

The end of the signatures of the high priests of the east, west, and Peloponnesus.

And so when this same Lord Ioasaf was dismissed, lifted from the throne, he made penitential prostrations before the high priests on both right and left. In this way he left the Great Church and went to his houses, which he had bought and stayed. Then a *kadi* and a slave came up and interrogated him. He paid for the things which he had taken wrongfully from the high priests and other consecrated men. In him the saying of holy David was fulfilled, “His deed will fall back on his head,”²⁶⁰ and so on.

After he was dismissed, the high priests made a synod and sat together one by one according to the rank [188] of his throne, in order to make a patriarch. There in the synod they declared unanimously with one will and opinion, and they cut out the most illegal and impious work of Simon, so that no one would pass *florins* whenever they perform ordinations, according to the twenty-ninth and thirtieth sayings of the divine and holy canons. And if one of the high priests violates these canons, he shall dismiss himself. As far as the *embatikion* is concerned, they allowed taking it. O inferno! They shook the leaves of the evil tree, and they cut the branches and the tree [itself], but they left the root, that is, they severed Simony from ordinations, but the root, that is the *embatikion*, they left, so that the tree of hell will spring up again and grow. Listen to what it says in the Acts of the Holy Apostles. When Simon Magus saw that the application of the hands of the apostles conveys the Holy Spirit, he gave money, that is *florins*, and he said to the apostles, “Grant me this authority so that when I apply place my hands on this, the Holy Spirit comes forth.”²⁶¹ The apostle Peter said to him, “Your silver,” that is your *florins*, “and you are banished and excommunicated to the destruction of the eternal fire, because you thought that the gift of God is granted [189] for *florins*.”²⁶² Woe to those high priests who sell the grace of the Holy Spirit and accept *florins*! But let us proceed to the remainder [of this work].

²⁶⁰ Psalm 7:16.

²⁶¹ Acts 8:19.

²⁶² Acts 8:20.

Metrophanes, Metropolitan of Kaisareia

After the synod of high priests dismissed the patriarch Lord Ioasaph, as we have said, they elected the Kaisareian patriarch. After they gave him the small message and the large one, he received the patriarchal throne. Thereafter the high priests at the patriarchate did not take *florins* in order to make priests. One [just] took his *embatikion*, when someone wanted to make a priest, and gave him a church. And hear what an *empatike* some high priests took! Since they were not taking money for ordination (so that they not transgress the saying of the divine laws and of the high priests, and in order that they not be condemned along with Simon Magus), they took double the [amount of the] *embatikion*, and so they suffered no loss from this business. They just went back to the first enjoyment of mammon. Alas! God is not fooled, and he does not look upon the face of a king, noble, high priest, or any other. But to each person he gives back according to his works, as God is just.

[190] But this same patriarch resigned in writing from the patriarchal throne and the high priesthood, on the fourth of the month of May, on Sunday, after the ordination of the Nikomedeian. After the high priests and clerics received [his resignation] they entered it in the records of the great church.

While this man, Lord Metrophanes, reigned as patriarch Sultan Süleyman died, the fourth emperor. He ruled for forty seven years, and during his reign these were the patriarchs, as we have written:

Lord Ieremias, who was metropolitan of Sophia.

And Lord Dionysios, who was metropolitan of Nikomedeia.

And Lord Ioasaph, who was metropolitan of Hadrianopolis.

And this Lord Metrophanes, who was metropolitan of Kaisareia.

When Sultan Süleyman died, his son became emperor, Sultan Selim. And during his reign Lord Metrophanes resigned.

But some high priests were found here in the Great Church, the number being up to twenty and more. When the synod formed they sat with the most honored clerics, in order to [191] elect a patriarch, an individual worthy to shepherd the great Church of

Christ rightly and justly, a living icon. They unanimously chose and elected the most all holy and God-adorned metropolitan of Larissa, Lord Ieremias, a righteous high priest, faultless, truly pious, compassionate, blessed, harmless, and immaculate. And behold, the saying of divine Paul, which he wrote to the Hebrews, was fulfilled: “Brothers, we need such a high priest”²⁶³ and so on. They gave him the small message.

Ieremias, Metropolitan of Larissa

At the hour of the vespers they performed the blessing according to protocol, and they slowly sang the vespers melodically. Gathered [there] were the most holy metropolitans, the most God-loving bishops, the most honorable clerics, and the high born nobles of the city and of Galata, as well as all of the people bearing Christ’s name. All of them were carrying candles in their hands. After the completion of the vespers the honorable and great steward of the great church, Lord Anasasios [from] among the priests, as first of the clerics, stood in the middle of the great church and announced loudly the great message to the holy Larrisan, the above-mentioned candidate, who [192] stood at the gates of the holy rostrum wearing the patriarchal cloak, stole, and pallium. He said to him, “The divine and holy synod of holy metropolitans, God-loving bishops, honorable clerics, high born nobles, and all of the people bearing the name of Christ call your high-priesthood from the throne of the most holy metropolis of Larissa, to the lofty and great patriarchal throne of the most holy Great Church of Christ.” Then the patriarch performed the Eucharist in accordance with protocol, and then he received the patriarchal staff. The high priests, one by one according to rank, went and kissed his hand, and he blessed them. They received him while singing the “Heavenly King, Intercessor, Spirit of Truth,” and they placed him on the great and lofty patriarchal throne. The Christians, religious and lay, ran with all joy and piety. They made obeisance before him and received blessing. And when all the people made obeisance, the people and patriarch went out of the church. He stopped, as was customary, and blessed everyone. Thus he left and went up to his holy cell, that of the patriarchs, who

²⁶³ Hebrews 7:26.

Lord God makes long living [so that he might] shepherd the great church of God [193] in all health of soul and body and expound rightly the word of truth for the benefit of the Christian people. He was led up to the lofty patriarchal throne in the 7080th year from the creation of the world on the fifth of May. The first liturgy of his all-holiness was at the festival of the holy and glorious ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, on the fifteenth of that month, there being great openness and a meeting of of high priests, clerics, nobles, and many other Christians. On the next day he took the *peşkeş*, at two thousand *florins*, and went to the *defterdar*, and he handed it over to the royal treasury (*hazine*). Then the *defterdar* took the patriarch. He went and kissed the hand of the emperor, as befits the prerogative which the patriarchs have had from the time of Sultan Mehmed, the first emperor who took the City, that he who becomes patriarch kisses the hand of the emperor. The emperor issued an order, and [the patriarch] received a *berat* from him. He gave to him all authority and power over all the pious Christians, religious and lay, that he may act in accordance with his law and faith, not having any hindrance from anyone. At that time the emperor was, as we have said, Sultan Selim.

And when the patriarch received the imperial *berat*, [194] he sat on the tribunal and, as Ecumenical Patriarch, he judged all things. And he judged as one imitating Christ. He did not look on the face of man, but made righteous judgments. And everyone rejoiced and took delight in His all Holiness. All the pious, young and old, sang of and glorified God, who gave them such a good and just shepherd.

Then, being moved by divine zeal, he wanted to set right the church of Christ, as His imitator, that is to say, to remove and to uproot altogether the evil tree of hell, which had become rotten; to chop [down] the branches and tree; to tear up the roots; to gulp it down in flames so that it not be seen anymore and does not spring forth anymore. I refer to the most illegal and diabolical work of simony. And after he sat upon the holy tribunal as common lord of the whole *oikoumene*, wearing the holy cloak with the rivers, and holding the patriarchal staff in his hands, a synod formed with the [following people] found [there] then: the all holy metropolitans of Herakleia, of Nikaia, of Nikomedeia, of Chalkedon, of Thessaloniki, of Prouses, of Amasia, of Monemvasia, of Berroia, of Old Patras, of Serres, of Larissa, of Ioannina, of Melenikos, of Lemnos, of Bizyes, of Lazia, and of Ischnanios; and the most God-loving bishops of Rhaidestos, [195] of Myriophytos, of Metron, and of Tzeroulos; and the most honorable clerics. And they presented the twenty ninth and thirtieth canons of the holy apostles, which declare that whoever becomes high priest, priest, or deacon with *florins*, or

whoever takes any other ecclesiastical appointment, that high priest who performed the ordination is deposed, along with the one who was ordained. Not only are they to be deposed, but they are also to be separated from the holy communion of Christians, like Simon Magus by Peter.

We have spoken concerning the *embatikion*.

Basil the Great wrote to his bishops that they not receive *florins* and perform ordinations, or they will be purged. He writes about this and about the *embatikion*, which some high priests take nowadays. The divine Zonaras explains the meaning [of this] in detail. He states that those who sell the grace of the Holy Spirit commit avarice, [and] avarice is the root of all evils and is called idolatry, because [idolatry] prefers idols to God and imitates Judas. For like him who handed over Christ to profit from money, likewise some high priests [commit] by their own will a second betrayal [196] [of] Christ, who was once crucified by us. These high priests who sell the gifts of the Spirit imitate Judas so much that the places that are purchased with such silver, that is to say the parishes and villages over which the ordained [persons] lord over or oversee, and the hands which receive the fruits, that is to say the revenues, should be called *akeldama*.²⁶⁴ *Akeldama*, which is a Hebrew word, means in Greek “field of blood.” It was mentioned in the Book of Acts. This is [where] it states that it is the place which was purchased with the money for which Christ was sold by Judas, the field, that is to say, the potter’s field. And being purchased with the money, it was considered and named the price of blood, in the same way money received from selling a gift of God, the parishes and places, that is to say the villages which have the parishes, which ordained priests buy from high priests and take for *florins*, that is to say, the *embatikion*, should be and should be called the price of blood.

And when the above-mentioned apostolic canons of Basil the Great were read, they wrote a section in the codex. It was signed by the common lord, the all-holy Ecumenical Patriarch, and by the above-mentioned holy high priests, that any high priest who infringes the divine canons mentioned above is to be deposed. And [197] by the grace of God Simony and the *embatikion*, which was also impious Simony, was broken and uprooted, as you heard above [where] we wrote it about at length.

As soon as [this] Christ-imitating patriarch completed this saving work, his desire and love turned to the study of Holy Scripture. Day and night he was studying and he

²⁶⁴ See Acts 1.19.

does [still] study theological, philosophical, ecclesiastical, and many other subjects. As Ecumenical Patriarch, father, and teacher, he did not stop and does not stop teaching and proclaiming the word of God to all the pious for their salvation, just as the wise patriarchs of old used to do. Studying every day, he recognized the maxim of divine David, which says: “Lord, I loved the beauty of your house and the site of your tabernacle of glory.”²⁶⁵ And Basil the Great and the divine Chrysostom [wrote], “Bless those who love the beauty of your house.”

Then he removed the entire partition and the holy gates, the old rotten one, and he made a new one, sculpted entirely with pure gold, along with gates for the sanctuary which has the divine annunciation of the holy *theotokos* [depicted on it]. Both right and left, above and below, he prepared the whole church and adorned it and equipped it with [198] various icons, large and small, and very beautiful vestements, and lamps in front of them. He also adorned the columns of the church and all the purple [raiment] and marble which is fastened above and below the walls. He also made four beautiful silver lamps with gold, and he put one in front of the masterful icon of our lord Jesus Christ. [He put] the second one in front of the icon of the wholly blessed mother of God, and the third above the golden partition, where the cross with gold is and on which the lord and savior of the world, Christ, is crucified. The fourth he hung in the middle of the church, I mean in the choir. He equipped the church of the Pammakaristos so radiantly and delightfully that the holy saying was fulfilled: “Brightly shining heaven, the church.” If you wish to be assured of this, at night, without hanging a light in this church, it shines like the whole sun, and illuminates above and below, inside and outside, and in both the forecourt and chapel, because of the gold and the silver and the other resplendent decorations.

He also built buildings from the ground up which were very beautiful. First he made a second holy patriarchal cell which was attached to the first one. The first and older one [199] he made into a tribunal with a very beautiful patriarchal throne. [He also made] many other chambers opposite the store-room. He made a large table there, and many other new chambers with a kitchen and a deep well. And further down, in the court-yard of the Patriarchate on the western side, he built from the ground up two beautiful large two-story residences with separate areas inside them for the repose of many high priests and other honorable persons. And [with regards to] the bigger one,

²⁶⁵ Pslams 26:8.

he made its basement a stable for horses, and the second one has an upper floor and a basement.

During the patriarchate of Lord Jeremias, Sultan Selim, the fifth emperor, died here in Constantinople on the throne of his realm. They buried him with great glory and candor as emperor in the church of Hagia Sophia. This sultan took Cyprus by the sword on the ninth of September, 1570. He killed some, and took other prisoner, with countless women and children.

His son Sultan Murat took the realm. The [number of] years from the birth of Christ were 1570 [*sic*]. When he sat upon the royal throne, he performed, and he [still] performs every day [acts of] great justice. He does not look upon the face of men; he only makes just rulings.

[200] When the nobles subject to his rule and other friends of his rule learned that there was a new emperor, they sent messengers with great and precious gifts, and they made obeisance before him. He received them with great love and thanked their lords very much, beholding their servility. The patriarch, taking the ordered *peşkeş*, or gift, two thousand *florins*, went, made obeisance before him, and kissed his hand, as is the custom for patriarchs. [The sultan] confirmed his *berat*, which his deceased father, Sultan Selim, had given. He gave the order, and they gave to him also another new *berat*, [which stated that] he appoint and judge according to his faith metropolitans, archbishops, priests, and every Roman person, as well as churches and monasteries. Whoever is seen to be opposed to his *berat* is to be chastised severely by his realm. The patriarch, taking the imperial *berat*, sat on his patriarchal throne as lord and master of the *oikoumene*. He judges and makes verdicts. The Christians receive honorable patriarchal letters concerning [various] subjects, and they have validity for the whole *oikoumene*. He does other similar things according to the lordship and authority which patriarchs possess.

[201] We have spoken also concerning another marvelous deed which the patriarch performed.

He also built a divine patriarchal throne, great and marvelous, with much fine artistry and with various things. It has precious and beautiful white bone and various other [works of] artistry, green, black, and of other appearances, [decorated in some] places with gold. It is there upon it that the divine patriarch stands. Above his divine and holy head is our lord Jesus Christ, the great high priest, depicted entirely with gold. Its length is one long span. What mind of man can comprehend the artistry and

appearance of the most lofty patriarchal throne? For when someone looks at it, from the brightness that it has from the many beautiful things from which it is built and made, it is apparent that the raiment is precious, interwoven with gold, and strewn with pearls and with twelve picked stones, carnelian, topaz, emerald, carbuncle, sapphire, jasper, hyacinthine, agate, amethyst, chrysolitho, beryl, and onyx and with other very precious and bright picked stones. It seems more beautiful and bright than the entire church. The divine throne has on one part a great, holy, and very beautiful icon [202] with gold, and it has the lowering [from the cross] of our Lord Jesus Christ and the divine internment of his all-holy body. He hung a silver lamp there and a light and it shines like the star of dawn.

He also made holy, very precious, and resplendent cloaks and tunics with many crosses, stoles, and beautiful silver utensils. When the priests and deacons don such [garments], they leave the sanctuary and come round the lofty throne and bow their heads. While saying a prayer, they resemble the divine angles, who stand before the fearful divine throne of heaven, bowing their heads and saying “Holy God, holy power” and so on. The desire and zeal of the common lord for the divine Church of the All-blessed was like that of divine Solomon for holy Zion and of the Emperor Justinian the Great for the Hagia Sophia. And just as God told the Emperor Justinian through his angel how to make it and how to equip it, in this way the All-blessed also told and tells to the living icon of her only son, who is the patriarch, true high priest of Christ, having grace from God. The word of the Lord through the Prophet Isaiah is fulfilled in him: “The one I esteem is [203] gentle and tranquil and trembles at my words.”²⁶⁶ Since the holy teachers say that the terrestrial heaven is the church and a resplendent heaven, the common master remembered this in his heart through divine illumination and made ornaments and beautiful and bright [things], which you heard about, in this holy shrine of the great Church of the All-Blessed. For heaven has, as we see, a sun, moon, and stars, and other things. This Church of the All-Blessed has, instead of the light of the sun, a most beautiful and bright golden partition, with, above, the life-giving golden cross, on which the lord Jesus Christ and savior of all human kind is crucified; icons for the Twelve Festivals for the Lord; and below the partition an icon of our lord Jesus Christ, large and resplendent. On the right part [it has] an icon for the holy *theotokos*, the all-blessed, very beautiful and bright, having precious golden vestements. The

²⁶⁶ Isaiah 66.2.

sanctuary door is very excellent, of great value. And the doors of the holy sanctuary are [made] entirely of gold, with the divine gospel greeting of the all-holy *theotokos*. Instead of the light of the moon and the stars, [the church] has silver lamps and the resplendence of the holy icons and all the beauty of the shrine, which you heard us say [204] is, inside and out, bright, luminous, and spectacular because of its beauty. Instead of the heavenly throne, he made the divine throne, the resplendent one which we have discussed. And just as the deity sits upon the throne in heaven, likewise does the master, bearing the icon of the one Christ of the holy trinity, our God, sit upon the divine terrestrial throne. This shrine of the great Church of the All-Blessed is and is called earthly heaven, New Zion, which Lord, not man, created. [It is the] pride and joy of the whole *oikoumene*, the beauty and mother of all churches, which may our mighty and fearful savior shield, strengthen, and guard from visible enemies, from all [that is] against [it], together with our all-holy lord and master, the Ecumenical Patriarch, forever and ever. May the divine word of the lord be fulfilled, the one that he said to the highest of the apostles: “You are Peter, and I will build my church upon this rock, and the gates of Hades will not prevail against it.”²⁶⁷

²⁶⁷ Matthew 16:18.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Ahmedî. *Tevârîh-i Mülûk-i Âl-i Osman*. Ed. Çiftçioğlu Nihâl Atsız. İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1949.

Annales Georgii Phrantzae. Ed. Immanuel Berrkerus. Bonn: Impensis, 1838. (Please note that when this text was published, the *Chronicon Maius* of Melissourgos-Melissenos was believed to have been the work of Sphrantzes. Thus the erroneous title.)

Chalkokondyles, Laonikos. *De Rebus Turcicis*. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae. Ed. Immanuel Bekkerus. Bonn: Impensis, 1843.

_____. *A Translation and Commentary of the "Demonstration of Histories" (Books I-III)*. Trans. Nicolaos Nicoloudis. Athens: St. D. Basilopoulos, 1996.

Χρονικόν Περί Των Τούρκων Σουλτάνων. Ed. G.T. Zoras. Athens: The Department of Byzantine and Neo-Hellenic Philology of the University of Athens, 1958.

Crusius, Martin. *Turcograecia*. Basel: Leonardum Ostenium, 1584.

Doukas. *Historia Byzantina*. Ed. Immanuel Bekkerus. Bonn: Impensis, 1834.

-----, *The Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*. Trans. Harry J. Magoulias. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975).

Herodotus. *The Histories* (Greek text). The Perseus Digital Library, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>

The Holy Bible: Containing the Old and New Testaments, King James Version. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1950.

Kritovoulos. *Critobuli Imbriotae Historiae*. Ed. Diether Roderich Reinsch. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1983.

_____. *History of Mehmed the Conqueror*. Trans. Charles T. Rigg. Princeton University Press, 1954.

Machiavelli, Nicola. *The Prince*. Trans. W.K. Marriott. Gloucester: Dodo Press, 2005.

Neşri, Mehmed. *Kitâb-ı Cihan-Nümâ*. Ed. Faik Reşit Unat and Mehmed A. Köymen. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1995.

Papasynadinos. *Conseils et Memoires de Synadinos, Pretre de Serres en Macedoine (XVIIe Siecle)*. Ed. Paolo Odorico. Paris : Pierre Belon, 1996.

Patriarchica Constantinopouleos Historia. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae. Ed. Immanuel Bekkerus. Bonn: Impensis, 1849.

The Siege of Constantinople 1453: Seven Contemporary Accounts. Trans. J.R. Melville Jones. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1972.

Spandounes, Theodore. *On the Origin of the Ottoman Emperors*. Trans. Donald M. Nicol. Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Sphrantzes, Georgios. *Memorii: 1401-1477*. Ed. Vasile Grecu. Bucharest: Editio Academiae Rei Publicae Socialistae Romaniae, 1966.

Thukydides. *Historiae* (Greek Text). The Perseus Digital Library. www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/.

Tursun Bey. *Târîh-i Ebü'l-Feth*. Ed. Mertol Tulun. Istanbul: Baha, 1977.

Secondary Sources

Adanır, Fikret and Suraiya Faroqhi (Ed.). *The Ottomans and the Balkans: A Discussion of Historiography*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Akgündüz, Ahmed. *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri ve Hukuki Tahlilleri*. Vol. 4. İstanbul: FEY Vakfı, 1990.

Angelov, Dimiter. *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204-1330*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Argyriou, Asterios and G. Lagarrique. "Georges Amiroutzes et son Dialogue sur la Foi au Christ Tenu avec le Sultan des Turcs." *Byzantinische Forschungen* 11 (1987).

Asad, Talal. *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).

Babinger, Franz. *Mehmed the Conqueror and His Times*. Trans. Ralph Manheim. Princeton University Press, 1978.

Barker, Ernest. *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium: Passages from Byzantine Writers and Documents*. Oxford University Press, 1961.

Dagron, Gilbert. *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium*. Trans. Jean Birrell. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Dvornik, Francis. *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background*. Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1966).

Emecen, Feridun M. *Yavuz Sultan Selim*. İstanbul: Yitik Hazine, 2010.

Faroqi, Naimur Rahman. *Mughal-Ottoman Relations: A Study of Political and Diplomatic Relations between Mughal India and the Ottoman Empire, 1556- 1748*. Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delli, 1989.

Fletcher, Joseph F. *Studies on Chinese and Islamic Inner Asia*. Ed. Beatrice Forbe Manz. Hampshire: Variorum, 1995.

Gibb, Hamilton A.R. "Lütfi Paşa On the Ottoman Caliphate." *Oriens* 15 (1962): 287-295.

Gregorio, Giuseppe. *Il Copista Greco Manouel Malaxos : Studio Biografico e Paleografico- Codicologico*. Vatican City : Scuola Vaticana di Paleografia, Diplomatica, e Archivistica, 1991.

Hagen, Gottfried. "Katip Çelebi." *Historians of the Ottoman Empire*. Ed. C. Kafadar, C. Fleischer, H. Karateke. www.ottomanhistorians.com. 2008.

Halasi-Kun, Tibor. "Gennadios' Turkish Confession of Faith." *Archivum Ottomanicum* 12 (1987-92).

Harris, Jonathan. "The Influence of Plethon's Idea of Fate on the Historian Laonikos Chalkokondyles." *Proceedings of the International Congress on Plethon and his Time, Mystras, 26-29 June 2002*. Ed. L.G. Benakis and Ch. P. Baloglou. Athens: Society for Peloponnesian and Byzantine Studies, 2004.

Imber, Colin. *Ebu'S-Su'ud: The Islamic Legal Tradition*. (Stanford University Press, 1997)..

İnalcik, Halil, and Rhoads Murphey. *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror*. Chicago: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1978.

İnalcik, Halil. *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age, 1300-1600*. Trans. Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973.

Karateke, Hakan T and Maurus Reinkowski. *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Knös, Börje. *L'Histoire de la Litterature Neo-Grecque*. Uppsala : Almqvist & Wiksell, 1962.

Kolodziejczyk, Dariusz. "Sultan as Imperator: Ottoman Rulers in the Eyes of their Non-Muslim Subjects."

Kunt, Metin and Christine Woodhead. *Süleyman the Magnificent and His Age: The Ottoman Empire in the Early Modern World*. London: Longman, 1995.

Monfasani, John. *Byzantine Scholars in Renaissance Italy: Cardinal Bessarion and Other Emigres*. Hampshire: Variorum, 1995.

Necipoğlu, Gülrü. *Architecture, Ceremonial, and Power: The Topkapı Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991.

Necipoğlu, Nevra. *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins: Politics and Society in the Late Empire*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler (15-17 Yüzyıllar)*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998.

Ostrogorsky, George. *History of the Byzantine State*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1969.

Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium. Ed. Alexander P. Kazhdan, Alice-Mary Talbot, et al. Volumes I, II, III. Oxford University Press, 1991.

Papademetriou, Anastasios G. "Ottoman Tax Farming and the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate: An Examination of State and Church in Ottoman Society (15-16th Century)." Princeton University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures (Dissertation), 2001.

Patrinelis, Christos. "The Exact Time of the First Attempt of the Turks to Seize the Churches and Convert the Christian People of Constantinople to Islam." *Actes du Premier Congres International des Etudes Balkaniques et Sud-Est Europ'ens* III (1969): 567-572.

Philippides, Marios. *Emperors, Patriarchs, and Sultans of Constantinople, 1373-1513: An Anonymous Greek Chronicle of the Sixteenth Century*. Brookline: Hellenic College Press, 1990.

----- . *Byzantium, Europe, and the Early Ottoman Sultans, 1373-1513*. (New Rochelle: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1990).

----- *The Fall of the Byzantine Empire: A Chronicle by George Sphrantzes*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1980.

----- "Makarios Melissourgo-Melissenos." *Historians of the Ottoman Empire*. Ed. C. Kafadar, H. Karateke, C. Fleischer. www.ottomanhistorians.com. 2008.

-----, “Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans.” *Historians of the Ottoman Empire*. Ed. C. Kafadar, H. Karateke, C. Fleischer. www.ottomanhistorians.com. 2008.

-----, “Damaskenos the Stoudite.” *Historians of the Ottoman Empire*. Ed. C. Kafadar, H. Karateke, C. Fleischer. www.ottomanhistorians.com. 2008.

Raby, Julian. “A Sultan of Paradox: Mehmet the Conqueror as a Patron of the Arts.” *The Oxford Art Journal*. 5.1 (1982): 3-8.

-----, “Mehmed the Conqueror’s Greek Scriptorium.” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 37 (1983): 15-34.

Reinsch, Diether Roderich. “Kritobulos of Imbros—Learned Historian, Ottoman Raya and Byzantine Patriot.” *Recueil des Travaux de l’Institut d’Etudes Byzantines*, XL (2003): 297-308. Runciman, Steven. *The Byzantine Theocracy*. Cambridge University Press, 1977.

-----, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence*. Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Todorova, Olga. “The Ottoman State and its Orthodox Christian Subjects: The Legitimistic Discourse in the Seventeenth-Century ‘Chronicle of Serres’ in a New Perspective.” *Turkish Historical Review*, I (2010): 86-110.

Walter, Christopher. *Art and Ritual of the Byzantine Church*. London: Variorum, 1982.

Yelçe, Zeynep Nevin. *Ideal Kingship in the Late Medieval World: Ottoman Principles and Perceptions*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2010.

Yerasimos, Stephane. *La Foundation de Constantinople et de Sainte-Sophie dans les Traditions Turques*. Paris: Institut Francais D’Etudes Anatoliennes D’Istanbul, 1990.

Zachariadou, Elizabeth A. *To Χρονικό των Τούρκων Σουλτάνων και το Ιταλικό του Πρότυπο*. Thessaloniki: Society of Macedonian Studies, 1960.